



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. DXXVII.

---

OCTOBER, 1900.

---

## BRYAN OR McKINLEY?

### THE PRESENT DUTY OF AMERICAN CITIZENS.

BY ADLAI E. STEVENSON, DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE FOR THE VICE-PRESIDENCY; SENATOR B. R. TILLMAN; EDWARD M. SHEPARD; RICHARD CROKER; ERVING WINSLOW, SECRETARY OF THE NEW ENGLAND ANTI-IMPERIALIST LEAGUE; CHARLES EMORY SMITH, POSTMASTER-GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES; SENATOR G. F. HOAR; SENATOR T. C. PLATT; SENATOR W. M. STEWART; ANDREW CARNEGIE, AND JAMES H. ECKELS, FORMERLY COMPTROLLER OF THE UNITED STATES CURRENCY.

#### I.

#### THE ISSUE OF THE CAMPAIGN.

IN each of the Presidential contests which have occurred within the last half-century the result has hinged, in large measure, upon a single issue. The campaign of 1852 resulted in the almost unanimous election of Pierce upon the supposed settlement of the slavery question by the "compromise measures" of the preceding Congress. Four years later, the salient question was the power of Congress over slavery in the Territories. Upon this issue the Democrats succeeded by a slender margin in electing Buchanan to the Presidency. In the exciting contest of 1860, every phase of the slavery question was, for months, the subject

of heated discussion. In fact, that contest—intensified by the Dred Scott decision—was but the renewal of the struggle upon the burning question which had so evenly divided parties at the preceding Presidential election. The “vigorous prosecution of the war” was the slogan of the victors in the campaign four years later. And “Reconstruction,” in its various phases, was the overshadowing issue upon which General Grant was triumphant in the two Presidential contests immediately succeeding the second election of Mr. Lincoln.

In 1876, “old things had passed away” and a new issue was to the forefront. “Reform” was the watchword of the Democracy. With this good word, with all that it implied, as the symbol of the paramount issue, the friends of Mr. Tilden waged an almost successful battle. The result, long in doubt, and finally reached by the decision of an extra-Constitutional tribunal, was adverse to the Democratic candidate by a single electoral vote.

In the three contests immediately succeeding the historic struggle last mentioned, the pivotal question in debate and the decisive one—affected in some degree by the personality of the candidates—was Tariff Reform. Special prominence was given to this issue by the passage of the “McKinley bill,” and denunciation of high protection as “robbery” by the Democratic Convention of 1892. In the first contest between the now opposing candidates for the Presidency, the question of Tariff Reform was held in abeyance, and Silver became the one vital issue of the struggle.

It is by no means asserted that, in these political contests of the past, no questions were discussed other than those I have mentioned. On the contrary, the entire pathway of the history of parties is luminous with debate along all lines of political thought. In the early days of the Republic, and before party organizations had attained to anything approximating their present discipline and authority, the “Jeffersonian and Hamiltonian Theories of Government,” “the Line of Demarcation between State and Federal Authority,” “Internal Improvements,” “the United States Bank,” “the Resolutions of ’98,” “Strict Construction,” “The Compromises of the Constitution,” etc., were subjects of endless debate for months preceding every Presidential election.

The contention is that, while there were many questions of

minor importance, and much expenditure of oratory upon mere abstract questions of government, yet, in the main, a single question was the storm-centre of controversy, and was decisive.

History has but repeated itself in the contest for political supremacy upon us now. One living question is to the forefront. It is in very truth the pivotal issue of the campaign. Political platforms may ignore it, yet it will not down. It is in the thoughts of men. It is with us to stay until it shall have been determined by the American people—the final arbiters, from whose judgment there is no appeal.

“Imperialism” is a new word in American politics. It had no place in the platform or the political controversies of the past. There had been no forecast of its possible existence as an issue in this campaign. It is a new question. How did it originate? Why is it here?

Events have followed upon each other so rapidly that we seem to have forgotten the avowed purpose of the late war with Spain. Our solemn declaration, before “breaking the peace of the world” in behalf of Cuba, was: “The United States hereby disclaims any disposition to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction or control over said island except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination when that is accomplished to leave the government and control of the island to its people.”

This disclaimer alone justified the declaration of war to our own conscience. It was believed by the American people to be a war waged solely in the interest of humanity, and in no sense for commercial or territorial gain. An eminent Republican Senator, while the joint resolution was pending, voiced the sentiments of his countrymen when he declared: “It is a war in which there does not enter the slightest thought or desire of foreign conquest or of material gain or advantage.” No one doubted at the time that this disclaimer upon our part applied not only to Cuba, but to all Spanish dependencies.

The “pacification” of the Island of Cuba—the avowed purpose of the war—has been achieved. Spain has sustained crushing and retributive defeat, and her flag, the hated emblem of tyranny to Cuban and Filipino alike, has disappeared forever from our hemisphere. Spain is at peace, well rid of colonial possessions that had been for centuries an obstacle to her material progress. But our Government is still engaged in war; not with



our ancient foe, but against our former allies in the war with Spain. It has been prosecuted at a fearful cost of treasure and of blood; little less than two hundred millions in money and many thousand valuable lives. Sixty thousand American soldiers are now in the Philippine Islands—and the end is not yet.

What is the justification for all this? Is it a war of self-defense, a war in the interest of humanity, or does it but add another to the long list of wars of subjugation and of conquest? These questions must give us pause. It is not strange that one whose love of liberty is inherited should have declared: "Uneasy consciences are multiplying in the Republican party."

When the ten million people of these twelve hundred islands are to abandon all hope of independence; when they are to lay down their arms and become our peaceable subjects; when the drain upon our blood and treasure is to cease—are questions no man is wise enough to answer. But granted that such, in the near or the remote future, is to be the termination of the struggle, what then? How are these people to be held and governed? What is to be their status? Are they to be citizens or subjects? If, as is claimed, they are incapable of self-government, are they to be vested by us with the dignity and the privileges of American citizenship, and entitled to representation in our National Legislature and in the Electoral College? No sane man can believe it. The only alternative, then, is government by force, by the power of the army and of the navy.

It need hardly be said that such government is wholly without Constitutional authority. Ours is a government of citizens, not of subjects. It is a government of limited powers, and its founders made no provision for holding "conquered provinces" or "alien peoples." The government of this far-away people, then, can only be by methods outside of the Constitution. In other words, there must be engrafted upon our body politic European methods of colonial government—a government that, in spirit, if not in form, pertains to the Empire and not to the Republic.

The justification for all this by Imperialists is that we can give these islanders a better government than they are capable of creating for themselves. What, then, becomes of the doctrine, so dear to our fathers, that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed?" What of the words of

Lincoln: "No man is good enough to govern another man without that other's consent; when he governs himself and also governs another man, then that is more than self-government—that is despotism."

It is claimed that we have outgrown the doctrines of the founders of the Government, and that we are henceforth to be "a World Power." This is, indeed, a high-sounding phrase, but it is well to know its real meaning. As a model to the builders of republics—and an inspiration to all peoples who desire a larger measure of freedom—our Republic has, from its beginning, been "a World Power." But in the sense used by Imperialists, the term is one of terrible significance. To become a World Power is "to break with the past;" to abandon the traditions and disregard the warnings of the patriots and the sages of the Revolution. It implies, of necessity, the equipments of the World Powers of Europe. It means an immense standing army, with its continuing and ever increasing burdens of taxation. The picture is not pleasing, but at no less cost can we hold place as "a World Power."

Our colonial possessions will, of necessity, be governed by methods that are despotic. The lessons of history are full of warnings. Creasy, the historian, in his "Decisive Battles of the World," says: "There has never been a republic yet in history that acquired dominion over another nation that did not rule it selfishly and oppressively. There is no single exception to this rule, either in ancient or modern times. Carthage, Rome, Venice, Genoa, Florence, Holland and republican France, all tyrannized over every province and subject state where they gained authority."

In the event of the defeat which is inevitable to the islanders, in their conflict with the great Power, what is to be our compensation for the fearful sacrifice of life and of treasure? "Commercial gain." To whom? Surely not to "the plain people." It is only theirs to bear the additional taxation the new policy imposes. It can only be to "the syndicated wealth" described in a recent letter of an eminent statesman of New England. Trade—"the calm health of nations"—is profitable only with peoples with whom we are at peace. Trade knows no sentiment. It goes only where it is profitable. Ninety per cent. of our exports reach European markets, for "only the civilized man is the con-

sumer." Is commercial gain the low plane upon which we stand? Is this our justification for abandoning the pathway marked out by the fathers, and along which we have found contentment and safety? Commercial gain to a class as the end of a war of conquest! Are there no higher motives to which appeal can be made? The words of Patrick Henry to the Virginia Convention may be recalled: "You are not to consider how your trade is to be increased, but how justice may be done, and how your liberties may be preserved."

The lust of empire is the plague that has come upon us in these closing hours of the century. Against it we are warned by the wrecks that lie along the entire pathway of history.

The new policy of Imperialism finds its inspiration in "corporate greed." This influence is potent as never before, in all the channels of authority. It has touched the springs of political power. Against it are the warnings of those whom we have been accustomed to revere. No statesman of the last generation discerned more clearly its appalling danger to republican government than did Mr. Lincoln. It is well now, when the attempt is made to enthrone commercial gain as the supreme good, to recall his prophetic words. In a letter written in 1864, he said: "But I see in the near future a crisis approaching that unnerves me and causes me to tremble for the safety of my country. As a result of the war, corporations have been enthroned and an era of corruption in high places will follow, and the money power of the country will endeavor to prolong its reign by working upon the prejudices of the people until all wealth is aggregated in a few hands, and the Republic is destroyed."

Authoritative declaration should be made at once to the people of the Philippine Islands that it is not our purpose to conquer or to subjugate them. Under existing conditions, they should be protected against the cupidity and aggression of foreign nations. All this, upon our part, to the end that the Filipinos may have the full enjoyment of liberty, and stable government fashioned by their own hands.

In view of all that has occurred, and of what must inevitably follow, in the event of the Republican Administration receiving a "vote of confidence" at the polls, are not Democrats justified in declaring Imperialism the paramount issue of the campaign? Other questions will be discussed. In terse words, the Demo-

cratic platform calls attention to the enormous growth of the Trust evil, and justly characterizes it as a menace to our free institutions. The Hay-Pauncefote treaty is condemned, as a surrender of rights not to be tolerated by the American people. But, in the presence of the overshadowing issue, even these are questions of secondary importance. Imperialism is the paramount issue. Around this, the battle will be most fiercely waged. Is it too much to say that its determination will be for the weal or the woe of the Republic?

ADLAI E. STEVENSON.

---

## II.

### CAUSES OF SOUTHERN OPPOSITION TO IMPERIALISM.

IN a few brief weeks, one of the grandest spectacles in the history of the world will take place. Fifteen million American freemen will march to the polls and record their choice for President. The Chief Magistrate of a great nation, one of the wealthiest and most powerful nations of the earth, will be chosen by the ballots of the individual citizens.

The stupendous power vested in the President of the United States is second only to that of the Czar of Russia, and the amount of patronage at his disposal is far greater than that of any potentate on earth. The President is in effect a King—uncrowned, it is true, but with far greater power than most kings are allowed to exercise. It is small wonder, then, that a Presidential election convulses our country from one end to the other; and that, as a Presidential election approaches, men of all classes cease to give attention to other matters, and the one all-absorbing topic of conversation and thought is this election. The struggle for the mastery between the great parties, and the policies and principles they represent, dwarfs every other interest, and political activity permeates the entire country. The crowded city and the rural hamlet are alike moved. The issues involved are so important, and the interests at stake are so great, that nothing else is thought of and talked about. The newspapers teem with editorials presenting the claims of the opposing candidates. The

mails are flooded with literature intended to educate the voters and rouse them to enthusiasm. Thousands of speakers, by day and by night, urge the claims of the parties they represent, and beg votes for the candidates of their choice. We are in the midst of such a convulsion now, and at no time in the past has there been more feeling and more intense interest.

The approaching election, in far-reaching consequences, overshadows any similar event in our history since the momentous canvass of 1860. The citizens of our great Republic are face to face with a crisis that does not come twice in the life of a generation. Indeed, the questions at issue in the present Presidential campaign are so momentous that the future historian may declare they outweigh those which convulsed the country at the outbreak of the Civil War. Then the issue was whether slavery should be extended into the Territories, and the country remain half slave and half free. Now, the paramount issue, as proclaimed in the Democratic platform and as admitted by President McKinley's letter of acceptance, is whether the country shall remain a republic in fact and in name, or whether our government shall undergo a change, and an Empire, resting on force and military power, shall take its place. That party which sneers at and tramples under foot the doctrine of the consent of the governed in the Philippines will soon sneer at that doctrine in the United States. Tyranny never advances openly and boldly to its goal. It approaches by indirection, and ever makes the fairest professions and promises.

There are other questions presented to the people for consideration, and they will, no doubt, have some weight in influencing votes; but they all dwindle into insignificance and can only claim a passing thought, while the great question of Republic or Empire fires the imagination and excites the eloquence of every man who writes or speaks on the subject. The questions of the currency and banks, gold and silver, of the income tax, and government by injunction, of trusts and how to check and control them—none of these can be discussed with any satisfaction, because the people, as a whole, are not interested in them, and these questions will cut a small figure in determining the result. And it is small wonder that this is the case. Republican orators may appeal for the maintenance of the "national honor," and they may urge upon the voters the claims of the party which,

they say, has given the working-man the "full dinner pail." They may urge upon the people the necessity of guarding against the "fifty cents silver dollar;" but the thoughtful, intelligent American cannot escape from the nightmare which haunts his dreams—the vision of the Empire and of the large standing army which the Empire would involve. This question is ever before him, and he considers the others of little moment just now. He reasons that "the full dinner pail" may or may not be the result of McKinley's election four years ago. Common sense teaches that there was an inevitable reaction from the depressed condition of the country following the panic of 1893, that enforced economy, and the closing down of manufacturing plants reduced the stock of goods, thus stimulating a demand, and under these influences, accompanied by the failure of the European wheat crop and the increase of the gold output, there was an inevitable revival of business and consequently re-employment for the idle workmen. The prosperity of the last four years is by no means general, even in the United States, and Republican policies following McKinley's election cannot have affected the prosperity of Europe, which has enjoyed a similar revival of business. Therefore the thoughtful working man will carefully consider whether or not he owes McKinley a vote this year, even if he is fortunate enough not to be idle and to have plenty to eat.

Then, along with the question of the "full dinner pail," will arise the suggestion of doubt as to whether there will not be a return of hard times, even though McKinley is elected. This thought will continue to haunt him: "What good will the 'full dinner pail' do me and my children, even though it should remain full for all future time—and I know that cannot be—if, by my vote, I assist in overthrowing the Republic which our fathers founded, and I become a party to the repeal and repudiation of the Declaration of Independence?" Of what use is a "full dinner pail" to the American who is no longer a freeman? Of what stuff is the American made who sells his birthright for a "full dinner pail"? This thought must come to every intelligent man who listens to the frantic pleas and arguments of the Republican orators.

Let us consider briefly whether the claim of the Democratic party, that the present election will settle the question whether or not we are to remain a Republic or become an Empire, is true.

The action of Congress in regard to Porto Rico leaves no doubt as to the purpose of the Republican party or its future policy, if again entrusted with power. It was avowed, in the debates in the House and Senate, that the reason Porto Rico was not given a territorial government similar to that of Arizona or New Mexico was that to give it such a government would be setting a precedent, entailing the necessity of treating the Philippines in the same way; and this the Republican leaders considered sufficient reason for refusing to do our "plain duty," as set forth in President McKinley's message. It is not contended by any Republican leader that there is any purpose to do more than govern the Philippines, after they have been subjugated, in accordance with the absolute will of Congress. They declare that the Constitution does not follow the flag, and the time-honored doctrine, aye, the sacred doctrine, that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed," is sneered at as an academic proposition, and any and every kind of argument is brought forward to show that it is puerile and has never had any binding force. The latest illustration, and one that is likely to become popular with Republican orators, is afforded by the Southern States, and the Republican speakers are even now ringing the changes on the inconsistency and absurdity of Southern white men proclaiming their belief in the doctrine that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed," while they deny the negroes of the South any place in governmental affairs. I will treat this subject more at length presently; but just now I want to put this question to my readers: Can the American Republic remain a republic, except in name, when the bed-rock upon which it rests is taken from beneath it? Can we, as a people, maintain our institutions in their full vigor, and enjoy the blessings which we have inherited from our fathers, when we wantonly destroy and cast away as rubbish the great charter of our liberties? Rome remained a republic in form a century after it had ceased to be a republic in fact, and the lessons of all history teach us that, if, under the starry banner of our country, a despotism is established in the Philippines and in Porto Rico, we will ere long see the establishment of a despotism in the United States. The Republic, to paraphrase Lincoln's words, cannot remain half subject and half free.

Now, in regard to the alleged "hypocrisy" of Southern Demo-

crats—that hypocrisy which gives such unction to Republican orators—I would call attention to certain facts. The disfranchisement of the ignorant Southern negroes in some of the States within Constitutional limits, does not in any way involve or destroy the truth of the declaration that “governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.” Jefferson, who penned those immortal words, was himself a slaveholder, and the Constitution which our fathers gave us recognized slavery, yet the apparent inconsistency with which Jefferson might be charged, and with which the founders of the Constitution might be charged, did not prevent the idea from becoming a religion to the people who enjoy the blessing of living under this Republic. The only legitimate and honest interpretation of the words is that in any Commonwealth the power to govern must emanate from within, and be by consent of the people governed. It was in contradiction of the doctrine of the divine right of Kings or of force from without, and any other form of government would be despotic. Hence, our use of the term “Imperialism,” which Jefferson and Lincoln would indorse if alive.

The mysterious influence of race antagonism and caste feeling cannot be discussed here. It has always existed; it is ineradicable; and it will continue as a governing factor wherever the races come into contact. The condition in the South, instead of offering an argument against the claim of the Democratic party that the Republic is in danger, and that we are threatened with Empire if Republican policies prevail, offers the very strongest object lesson, going to prove the truth of that contention. There are about nine million blacks in this country; and the race riots in New York City, and the bloody tragedy in Akron, Ohio, should silence for all time any charges against the Southern whites of being more cruel in their treatment of the negro than Northern men are. The difference between the treatment of negroes by Southern mobs and the treatment of the negroes in the North is that Northern white men vent their anger upon the blacks indiscriminately, and that their race hatred is so intense that the innocent and unoffending are made to suffer. In the South, on the other hand, the mob hunts down the man who is guilty or supposed to be guilty, and innocent negroes are not molested. The Anglo-Saxon is pretty much the same wherever you find him, and he walks on the necks of every colored race he comes into



contact with. Resistance to his will or interests means destruction to the weaker race. Confronted, as we are, within our own borders with this perplexing problem, why do we seek to incorporate nine millions more of brown men under the flag? Republican leaders do not longer dare to call into question the justice and the necessity of limiting the negro suffrage in the South. They only propose selfishly to take advantage of the provision of the Fourteenth Amendment, which gives Congress the right to cut down representation in the Electoral College of any State which has denied suffrage to any of its citizens. The negro is to be sacrificed, provided the South shall thereby be stripped of political power. The Republican party is anxious to see this purpose consummated.

With what right, then, can the party of Lincoln, or the party which has claimed to stand for all of Lincoln's ideals and aspirations, twit Southern men with inconsistency and insincerity? We have inherited our race problem and the question is not one that can be thrust aside voluntarily. "The White Man's Burden" is upon us, and, like Sindbad's Old Man of the Sea, will be upon us for all time. Is that any reason why we should lose our liberties at home and become a part of an Empire, holding in subjugation nine millions of Malays, with the probability and almost certainty of further expansion if Republican policies prevail, and of having ere long fifty or a hundred million Chinese in addition? Was Lincoln a dreamer when he said that "the Republic cannot endure half slave and half free?" Because the Southern whites have felt constrained to deprive some of the negroes of a share in the Government, thus denying to them the recognition embodied in the declaration that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed," is that any reason why this great Republic should seek to subjugate more men of the colored race, and deny them that great blessing?

Those who criticise the Southern white people in their dealings with the suffrage question may well be asked: "Has not the Republican party silently acquiesced in all that has been done in recent years in this matter? Who has heard any protest from Mr. McKinley or his advisers?"

If the South has applied drastic remedies to a deadly disease, which it inherited, it cannot be said that any one of her citizens has advocated or indorsed the maintenance of slavery anywhere

within the jurisdiction of the United States, as Mr. McKinley has done in his Sulu agreement.

We of the South have never acknowledged that the negroes were our equals, or that they were fitted for or entitled to participate in government; therefore, we are not inconsistent or hypocritical when we protest against the subjugation of the Filipinos, and the establishment of a military government over them by force. Conscious of the wrongs which exist in the South, and seeking anxiously for a just and fair solution of the Race Question, we strenuously oppose incorporating any more colored men into the body politic. We dread the reflex action, the example, the familiarizing of our people with despotic methods. We do not want to add to the perplexities involved in the Race Question in the South the greater danger involved in the conquest and government of the Philippine Islands, outside of and contrary to the Constitution. All other issues are dwarfed, therefore, by this issue, in our minds. The South to-day affords the purest and best type of American citizenship. What I mean is that the people who inhabit the States south of the Potomac and Ohio rivers are the descendants of men who founded the Government. They are "native and to the manner born," to the second, third and fourth generation. They are lacking in some of the elements of progressiveness which characterize Northern communities, but they possess civic virtues which were the boast and glory of the American citizen. of fifty years ago, in a much larger proportion than exists in any other section of the country. And in the future, if not in the coming election, the people of that section will be the conservative force which will preserve our institutions—if they are to be preserved. We are nearly all Americans and cling to American traditions. We have the genuine, original seed-corn of liberty.

The Republican party cannot, with any degree of self-respect or decency, ask the American people for leave to subjugate the Filipinos for the purpose of governing them as Southern negroes are governed. This cannot be done, in the first place, because the conditions are different. In the South, the races are commingled in every community, and material for intelligent, honest officials exists everywhere. Nothing of the kind can be found in the Philippines. In the second place, the Republican party will belie all its boasted past if it is allowed to consummate its scheme of

conquest and to set up a military despotism in the East. Mr. Hoar protests that the Republican party is the party of liberty and can be trusted, and he does this in the face of the President's declaration that the Filipinos will be given only such share in the government as we consider them "capable of exercising." How can Mr. Hoar defend the abandonment of the negroes by the Republican party at home, and defend the President's policy of subjugating the Filipinos with a view to governing them with greater hardships than Southern negroes have ever had to endure? Mr. Hoar is opposed to conquering and retaining the Philippines, but Mr. Hoar supports Mr. McKinley, and Mr. McKinley is committed to that policy irrevocably; and no Republican leader, not even Governor Roosevelt, will now dare to wave the bloody shirt and preach a crusade against the South's treatment of the negro. The North has a bloody shirt of its own. Many thousands of them have been made into shrouds for murdered Filipinos, done to death because they were fighting for liberty. There is no parallel in history for such a somersault. The two parties have swapped places since 1860. The Democratic party now stands for liberty and true American principles. It still believes in the Declaration as written and understood by the author and his compatriots of 1776. The Republicans repudiate the Declaration and are as besotted in pursuing the scheme of conquest and robbery in the East, as the slave oligarchy of 1860 was in supporting the institution of human slavery in the South. The people are thinking as they have never thought before, and every patriot awaits with bated breath the verdict which will be rendered in November.

B. R. TILLMAN.

---

### III.

#### SUPPORT OF MR. BRYAN BY SOUND-MONEY DEMOCRATS.

THE greater number—I believe much the greater number—of citizens who before 1896 had acted with the Democratic party, but in that year opposed its Presidential candidate, will this year support him. They will do this, though he has not recanted his silver heresy, and though now, no less than in 1896, they condemn his error. Their course in 1900 is not only right in itself—and

that is the principal thing—but it consists with the whole frame of their political belief. Any other course would be inconsistent with that belief, and with the principle which determined their vote in 1896.

The Indianapolis platform upon which in that year some of the Sound-Money Democrats nominated Senator Palmer was a fine declaration of faith in democratic self-government. It demanded a gold standard of value. But to those who wrote or supported that platform, and to the far greater number who believed in it, the gold standard was no more than one practical result or illustration of a creed broader and deeper than any rule of coinage. They did not make of it a political deity; that would have been no better than its personification as a tyrant. The gold standard was for the time critically important; but it was important, nevertheless, as a detail or result, not as a principle. Its temporary rank in the politics of 1896 was due to a condition then, but not now, existing. Although modern business had then moved steadily and irresistibly towards the gold standard, and although modern industrial welfare clearly required it, nevertheless it was not yet clearly founded in our legislation, but was the subject of immediate and practical political difference, made acute by the fall in the price of silver. During the four years since 1896, financial changes the world over have, even more firmly and more plainly, established the gold standard; it has been adopted in American statute; and political opposition to it in the United States has died away into subordinate and tepid statements which are no longer practical, but are, though never so sincere, made chiefly out of regard for the jewel of consistency so much preached and so often forgotten by statesmen. The Gold Democrats were, in 1896, neither more nor less than men of generally Democratic faith dealing with a specific and temporary question, upon the basis of their general hostility to interference with economic laws by governmental fiat. In 1900 they remain Democrats, having little practical call to deal with that question, but having every call to deal with one vastly larger and deeper. In 1900, they are concerned, not with a detail or illustration of the principles enunciated at Indianapolis in 1896, but with their very foundation. Shall this people reverse their supreme rule of government with the consent of the governed, that rule in assertion of which they have, during a

century and a third, struggled to a greater and greater result of world-reforming beneficence and domestic prosperity? Shall we substitute military and Mohammedan ideals for those of industrial righteousness and peace, which we have thus far kept steadfastly before our eyes—sweeping away one by one obstructions and exceptions which have tormented or disgraced our nation, and from decade to decade more and more nearly reaching full realization? Sound Money Democrats, if their faith in self-government remain—and without that faith they were never Democrats—are bound in 1900 to vote with a regard to the Philippine policy of the President as controlling as was their regard in 1896 to the fallacious and dangerous silver proposal.

Is not this clear? Sound Money Democrats in 1896 did not abate hostility to the system of special privilege for small and rich interest, the greater wealth of a few at the cost of the many, for which the Republican party then stood and now stands. Nor did they permanently abandon their own party because it had once and lamentably adopted, and then defended, an economic illusion which the Republican party had adopted, and which in itself was not as widely or permanently corrupting as the Republicans' belief in a paternal government. Indeed, every political party, at one time or another, preaches some illusion, economic or social; probably no great political party is ever free from such illusion. Hardly a political platform can be quoted which has on every article commanded the support of the majority of a great party, or escaped the condemnation of an important minority. When questions of slavery were uppermost, very many Democrats acted with the Republican party, although hostile to a protective tariff and to much else for which the majority of the Republican party seemed to stand. Precisely the same happened in 1896, when free coinage was uppermost. Surely illusion about coinage was in itself no worse than illusion about protective tariffs, nor as bad. The illusions were equally venerable and lamentable, but the corruption of the latter far deeper and wider and more difficult of treatment. The silver illusion had before 1896 found its most dangerous support among Republicans and its most resolute opposition among Democrats. During the concern of our politics with the money question for twenty years before 1896, President McKinley had dedicated his gift of pleasing eloquence to the cause of free coinage at the ratio of 16 to 1;

that cause then seemed to be popular. From President Cleveland's entrance into national politics in 1884 until he last left the Presidency, he dedicated his gift of resolute and courageous honesty to the cause of sound money; that cause then seemed to be unpopular. Each of the statesmen found much support and much opposition within his own party. It is only ten years ago that a Republican President and Congress (Mr. McKinley voting for the bill) enacted the Sherman Silver Law—the most dangerous of the victories of the free silver forces. The same administration admitted to the Union territories which, though their populations were then meagre for statehood, were at least ready to contribute to the Senate several and perhaps decisive votes for free silver.

In 1896, the business depression created exceptional temptation to political vagary. The Republican administration of 1889-1893 not only surrendered to silver, but increased the "protective" advantage to favored interests beyond the extremest point of former Republican legislation, and enormously increased pensions for a war which had ended almost thirty years before. No doubt in 1893 other conditions of business distress had long been gathering; but these acts of national improvidence and unwisdom helped to prepare for that year its widespread financial disaster and industrial distress. To others belonged the causes; but President Cleveland had to meet the result, and he did meet it as befitted leadership of a democracy. He used no smooth words; he did not pretend that laws could take the place of harvests, or industry or thrift. He offered no nostrum or panacea. Instead, he applied all the powers which, for a few months, are the property of a newly inaugurated President, to something really within the power of law makers—a reversal of the free silver victory accomplished by Messrs. Allison and McKinley and their associates. It was a fine display of civic courage and unselfish skill, and like that of the earlier Democratic President who, in 1837, in spite of the outcry of business distress, refused to add new folly to follies which had already produced the distress, and instead drove through the Sub-Treasury a bill which brought to an end—at least for a time—the corrupting partnership between the government and the banks. The fundamental proposition of both Presidents was, that all the people should support the government rather than that the government should support some of the people at the cost

of the rest. But *post hoc propter hoc* is the easiest, as it is the shallowest, of reasoning in politics. If business depression followed President Cleveland's inauguration, did he not, therefore, produce it? The last thing which had happened was sufficient for careless or untrained minds, whether of Democrats or Republicans. The real cause, however, was something further back and more truly dynamic than a change of Presidents. If for nothing else, the Republican party deserves defeat for the shallow demagoguery with which in 1900 it refers the business distresses of 1893-1896 to the slight reductions of tariff made by the Wilson bill, and to the incoming of President Cleveland. For this proposition the Philadelphia Convention and its chief supporters have declared that every vote for President McKinley shall be counted. It was wrong for Republicans to ascribe hard times to trifling tariff reductions, which were made a year after the hard times began, and the business effect of which had hardly begun when the hard times ended. So it was wrong, but no more wrong, for the Democratic Convention of 1896 to ascribe hard times to the sound money policy in which President Cleveland had been steadfast, whether when, during his first term, he prevented legislation such as his Republican successor approved, or when, in his second term, he procured the repeal of that legislation. There was, in truth, less folly in the belief that the sound money policy had produced hard times, than in the belief that Democratic tariff reductions had produced them. For it needs no Adam Smith to perceive that hard times must have been caused by a serious and long continuing cause; and the sound money policy was—as the Wilson tariff bill clearly was not—a serious and long continuing cause, which had doubtless produced economic results real, though different from, and more wholesome than, those ascribed to it by the silver advocates. If Republicans do not desert Mr. McKinley and their party for his and its long coquetry with silver, and for their immoral and shallow charge of hard times upon the Cleveland administration and the Wilson bill, surely Democrats need not feel bound, after the silver issue is practically past, to desert their party because of their candidate's devotion to the same policy, and the declaration of the Chicago Convention of 1896 that hard times had been due to the success of the sound money cause.

In 1896, Republicans demanded more protection to favored

and special interests as the true cure for hard times; and a majority of Democrats as their cure demanded free silver coinage at the old ratio. With the Republican party controlled by this chronic belief in making men rich by legislation, and with another form of the same belief in temporary control of the Democratic organization, the Sound Money Democrats had to determine their duty. They could not then support Mr. Bryan without stultification. He had, with a courageous frankness which shone in comparison with the neutral platitudes about money and the glorification of protection by the statesman of Canton, declared free coinage to be the first issue. The people, ignoring all other issues, declared it to be the all-paramount and present issue. The Sound Money Democrats came out of the campaign of 1896 with no spoils of office, but with the entire moral victory. For they had not, like President McKinley and his party, opposed Mr. Bryan with vague and insincere promises of bi-metalism. They *meant* gold and they *said* gold. To them, whether those who voted for Senator Palmer, or those who, not daring "of two evils to choose neither," voted for President McKinley, more than to any equal body of citizens, was due the character, the emphasis and the final decisiveness of the result.

The Democratic party remains. Like the Republican party and all other parties, it has, from time to time, made its mistakes and had its vagaries. But they are less deeply seated in its essential philosophy, and, therefore, less chronic, than those of the Republican party. And surely if, four years ago, good citizens adhered to the latter when they believed it to be right on a present and paramount issue, they need not scruple to adhere to the Democratic party when in 1900 it is right on that other and greater issue, which for 1900 has become present and paramount.

The American people are to-day little concerned with what the Republican administration has done willingly about the tariff, or has done unwillingly about the currency. They are seriously concerned with its policy in the Philippines and Porto Rico. They may praise, or they may condemn. But whether they praise or condemn, their concern is deep and vital. Some admire the President's policy as an inspiring departure from a career hitherto "parochial," or piously see in it a surrender to God's own leading. Others condemn it as a betrayal of democracy. But all alike, including both candidates, recognize that



policy as the chief and controlling feature of his administration. If the sound political rule for a country governed, like ours, by two great parties, is to be followed, the campaign should turn on that policy. If the programme invented and carried on by the President or by those who act through him, be right, then he should be re-elected that he may carry it to a conclusion. If it be wrong, then he should be defeated, and a President should be chosen who will reverse that policy. This would and should be the rule, if the question were no more important than the tariff or silver coinage or the Isthmian canal. The rule is rigorously imperative when the question concerns the fundamental proposition of American government and civilization.

Is such a question, then, practically presented? It is President McKinley's expressly declared policy to complete the military conquest of the Philippines, and thereafter, and for such time as we think fit, to hold in military subjugation the eight million Filipinos. For this purpose the President maintains and, if re-elected, he will continue to maintain, an army of 75,000 men, in addition to those otherwise needed. For this purpose he has inflicted and, if re-elected, he will continue to inflict, death, disease and desolation upon thousands of Americans and tens of thousands of Filipinos. For this purpose he compels the peaceful labor of his countrymen to contribute annually not less than \$100,000,000, with a return in profit to a score of American traders of less than two per cent. of this cost. Here is the practical side of the question; and it is sufficiently serious. But it is the lesser part of the issue. Dollars and lives, no doubt, may be justly spent for a great cause of humanity. The President proposes (nor can his fair phrases or audacious references to Abraham Lincoln, without daring to quote him, conceal his intention, or that of the strong men behind him), as the result of our final military success in the Orient, that the American people shall adopt the policy of holding alien and distant races in permanent and military subjection, without share in their own government except as the American people choose to accord it, and also without share, as matter of right, in the American Constitution. We now call this policy Imperialism. The name is not of moment; but it fits the thing. Disraeli chose the title "Empress" for the Queen when exercising that arbitrary dominion of Great Britain over India which we are to emulate.

It is for this Imperialism that the dollars are to be spent and the death, disease and desolation to be inflicted, and all the long hatreds and corruptions of war to be incurred. Nor is it a new topic for Americans. Again and again and again, from the outcry against the Stamp Act in 1766 to the adoption, more than a century later, of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments, has the whole scheme been deliberately considered and condemned by the American people. In that condemnation, we have found our supreme and characteristic political glory. Every solemn, responsible and undiscredited declaration of our statesmen, all the teaching of our town meetings, our churches and our schools have joined in the condemnation. If our practice have not equalled our preaching—if in the treatment of Indians or of Negroes within our borders our principle has been violated,—we have not, therefore, denied the principle, but have profoundly regretted that calamitous and inconsistent exceptions should have been imposed upon us by the presence of these inferior races in the midst of our population before the Declaration of Independence. These we have declared an evil to be escaped or ended where practicable, never a good to be preserved and extended. We have opposed and dreaded the addition of any like difficulty. Never before—unless in Ostend manifestoes rejected by the people with disgust—has it been proposed that our Republic should conquer another land or another race, or acquire any land or people unless to dower them with the civil rights of Americans. One by one, and sometimes at cruel cost, we have reduced the exceptions within our domain to the universality of the American principle. We have, until now, moved steadily nearer and nearer—though God knows we may still be distant—to the ideal of that Declaration, which extorts from even President McKinley a formal and reluctant reverence. The issue, therefore, is not only of blood and treasure and Imperialism, but of reversal of what we have made the fundamental proposition of our New World civilization. And more. There is in the issue this, whether we shall reverse this proposition at the very time when its fruits are more splendid than ever before, and its success, moral and material, are known of all men to be vastly greater than any achieved by empire. Out of the buoyancy, energy, courage which are born of that orderly liberty, in which every one is jealous of the rights of others, as involving for the future the safeguard of

his own rights, has come the marvellous productiveness of American labor. The wealth of the rich, never before so great, the order and safety of life and property, never so great throughout so extended a field, the well-being of labor, the wonderful reach and growth of all these in our land are due, so far as human effort or wisdom has produced them, to our translation into politics of the sacred rule of Christianity—to our supreme dedication to the doctrine that, in their rights as citizens, all men are created free and equal, and that God “hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth.”

President McKinley and his supporters will not and dare not directly argue the question. They evade its merits by collateral and subordinate objections, criticisms, defenses. But it will not down. They threaten a panic, as if their Secretary of the Treasury before campaign necessities constrained him, and Mr. Russell Sage, who, perhaps, of all Mr. McKinley's supporters, may be deemed most expert in panics, have not pointed out that there can be none, as if the threat were not a silly imputation upon nearly if not quite one-half of the American people. They tell us that Mr. Bryan, if President, would set up the silver standard, as if the gold law, according to the Republican platform itself, did not make this impossible without violation of his oath of office, or as if he had not made clear that he is no perjurer, but courageous, honest, law-abiding. They tell us the gold law itself will be in danger, when they know that neither a Senate nor a House can be found during the next Presidency to pass a free-coinage bill, and that a large, and perhaps the larger, part of the Democratic party are to-day hostile to free coinage. President McKinley cynically points out that, in the suppression of the negro vote, the South is doing what he is trying to do in the Philippines, as if that were a reason *for*, rather than a telling reason *against*, his course; or as if the enormous difficulties inflicted upon us by the crime committed centuries ago against the negro race ought to be matched by like difficulties assumed in Asia; or as if wise Southerners, like wise Northerners, do not hate the new departure, because it will bring upon us more of the inconsistency-breeding difficulties from which the South suffers. They point out the Chicago heresies of four years ago and their nominal re-adoption at Kansas City, as if there were no paramount issue overshadowing them all, or as if citizens voting for a can-

didate must vote for the entire platform, or as if they did not know that President McKinley himself can be elected only by inducing a sufficient number of his countrymen to forget assertions in the Philadelphia platform which are to them false and unrighteous. They give us garbled accounts of how the President got into his 'difficulties, as if the question were how we came to the Philippines, rather than what we have done and shall do with them and their people. They tell us that England has had both liberty and Imperialism, as if the American Declaration and the American Constitution or their splendid fruits belonged to her, or as if her prosperity and glory had arisen from her arbitrary extensions of power by the sword rather than from her vigorous extirpation of everything imperial at home, and from her self-governing and non-imperial colonies across the seas.

I cannot here argue these or other objections. Not one touches or begins to touch the question, whether or not, on the Asiatic coast, eight thousand miles from our nearest shores, the Republic shall pursue a career of conquest of foreign peoples, to hold them, not as citizens or with rights under our Constitution, but as subjects. Nor does President McKinley dare to argue or even explicitly to mention the question. To promote the wrong of it naturally assemble all who believe that might makes right, that the stronger should crowd the weaker, and that, as Senator Hanna argued, the American should find his sole creed and his sole glory in his "dinner pail."

It is a true battle for the dignity of American manhood and for the everlasting rights of the masses of men. Surely, no Democrat ought to doubt on which side he will stand.

EDWARD M. SHEPARD.

---

#### IV.

#### THE INTEREST OF THE FIRST VOTER.

VICTORY in November, 1900, will be won by the party which appeals most successfully to the new voters, the citizens who have come of age since the Presidential election of 1896. His first national ballot is a matter vastly more important to a young man than a vote is to a veteran. The arguments usually addressed to

men who are in the habit of voting the Democratic or the Republican Presidential ticket, are by no means the best for those who have never voted for a President, and who are making up their minds with which of the two great parties to ally themselves.

There are really only two national parties. It is not likely that there will ever be more than two, of commanding influence, at any one time.

With which of the two parties at present dividing the serious thought of the country can the First Voter ally himself, with the assurance of promoting his own good as well as that of his country? The idea that a young voter thinks of himself first, and then of his country, is, no doubt, shocking to purely theoretical politicians. Practical men, however, know it to be a fact. Facts are what the managers of national campaigns have to deal with, and the campaign manager who gets hold of the most facts and acts in accordance with them is the one who succeeds. The fight is won by the man behind the ballot. His leaders theorize, but he votes. The commanding officer in a battle may have his manual of tactics at his fingers' ends, but the fate of his cause is decided by the man behind the gun. All the books in the world cannot teach a greenhorn on the firing-line to shoot his rifle straight. The fine-spun theories of the scholar in politics are equally useless to the voter who approaches the polling-booth for the first time.

Thinking, then, of himself and of his own future, his business or his profession, his family and his friends, the average young American must make up his mind along which of the two party paths his best interests lie. By following that path, he will at the same time be best serving his country. It seems to me that there can be no sort of doubt that the welfare of the country, as a whole, is best promoted by that which is best for its young men. That disposes of the objection that the view I am advancing of political duty is a purely selfish one. The youth of the land are its life blood. How can they be most effectively and wholesomely stimulated and directed?

It is an inspiring topic, this appeal of the two great national parties to a million young men for the first time assuming the highest duty and privilege of citizenship.

Under which banner will American youth enlist in November,

1900? It is quite likely that the decision then made may determine the political affiliations of these young men, this magnificent army of American electors, for their lives. It is not unlikely, indeed, that it will also determine the political views of their brothers and sons, when they, in turn, reach the age of franchise. How vastly important it is, then, to the Democratic party that the young voters should this year cast Democratic ballots! If there are clear and convincing reasons why the Democracy offers young voters the greatest and surest opportunities, a public service, a service not only to the party but to the American people, can be rendered by a presentation of those reasons in a periodical like *THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW*.

The entire number of votes cast in November, 1884, was 10,044,985. Of these, 4,911,017 were polled for Grover Cleveland, and 4,848,334 for James G. Blaine. Of the ten million ballots, Cleveland had a plurality of only 62,683.

In four years, the Presidential vote of the American people had increased, in 1888, to 11,380,860, of which Grover Cleveland received 5,538,233 and Harrison 5,440,216, Cleveland still having 98,017 more votes at the polls, although Harrison had a majority in the Electoral College, and was, of course, elected President.

In November, 1892, the American people cast 12,059,351 votes, of which 5,556,918 were polled for Cleveland, and 5,176,108 for Harrison. Cleveland's plurality this time was 380,810.

By November, 1896, the votes of the people for President had increased to 13,923,102. Of these 7,104,779 were cast for William McKinley, and 6,502,925 for William Jennings Bryan.

Mr. McKinley's plurality, the first the Republican party had had in twelve years, was 601,854, being the largest plurality any Presidential candidate had had since 1872. In that year General Grant, the hero of the war, entrenched in power by four years' occupation of the White House, was elected President over Horace Greeley, the reformer, by a plurality of only 762,691 votes in the popular vote.

Now, the normal increase in the number of votes for President, reckoning from one four years to another, is more than ten per cent. Adding ten per cent. to the vote of 1892, would give us an estimated vote for 1896 of 13,265,286; whereas the actual vote in 1896 was 657,816 more than that. It is plain, then, that

unless the excess over the estimated ten per cent. can be accounted for by immigration, we must reckon on considerably more than a million first voters every four years. And there will naturally be a slight continuous increase in the percentage.

Adding, then, ten per cent., as the most conservative estimate of increase, to the 13,923,102 votes cast in November, 1896, it is reasonable to suppose that at least 15,315,412 votes will be cast for President on November 7th, 1900. That is to say, about 1,400,000 more electors will vote for President this year than four years ago.

But it is not accurate to treat all this increase as new voters, or rather as first voters. To be admitted to citizenship, the ordinary immigrant, who has not enlisted in and been honorably discharged from the army, must have "resided continuously in the United States for at least five years." Evidently this condition will bar from a vote next month all immigrants, otherwise eligible, who did not land prior to November 7th, 1895, and who did not properly follow up their arrival by declaring their intention to become citizens. A Presidential election has been held since that date, but none of the adult male immigrants who arrived in this country subsequent to November, 1891, could have voted in November, 1896. Therefore, all the adult male immigrants who arrived in the United States in the last two months of 1891, and in the years 1892, 1893, 1894, and in ten months of 1895, may vote in November, 1900, if they have complied with the law. The total number of immigrants arriving in that period was about 1,767,144. One-fifth of that number would be 353,228. In round numbers there are 350,000 immigrant adults who may cast their first Presidential vote next month. Nearly all of them will do so. Our newly admitted foreign-born citizens seem to have a higher opinion of the value of the franchise than some whose families have been here for a hundred years or so.

Deducting this estimate of 350,000 electors naturalized since the last Presidential election, we still have more than 1,000,000 young Americans to cast their first votes in November, and thereby to decide whether Mr. Bryan or Mr. McKinley shall go into the White House on the fourth of next March.

Mr. McKinley's plurality in 1896 was 601,854. There are twice as many voters now coming to the polls, in addition to 350,000 citizens naturalized since 1896. The right sort of an appeal to these new voters is all important.

There can be no doubt that these electors casting their first Presidential ballot will decide this Presidential election.

How are the majority of the new voters likely to go? Which of the two great parties will they choose—for I assume they will not throw away their votes by casting a ballot for Caffery, or for any crank ticket? Where do the interests of the young men lie?

Coming to the United States more than fifty years ago, I have had, boy and man, opportunities of watching what is to me the most significant change this wonderful half century has wrought. I, too, have experienced the perplexities and thought out the responsibilities attendant on the right casting of a first vote. In the year 1864, at the age of twenty-one, I cast my first ballot. I felt then that the Democratic party was the young man's party; that the young blood of the nation must naturally be drawn toward Democracy, which made a ready place for the newcomers, and welcomed them to a share in the management of the affairs, even into the councils, of the nation. Nor, in the thirty-six years since I cast a ballot for George B. McClellan, have I seen any good cause for changing my views on this subject. It is, indeed, my deliberate opinion that the Democratic party is the only party which offers an even chance to the first voter, not only in the political contest, but in the battle of life as well.

The struggle for existence has gradually become harder and harder in the United States. Man has a right to more than bare existence. Yet the competition between organized wealth and individual effort grows more and more cruel. Everywhere is felt the greedy grasp of corporate monopoly, destroying the first voter's opportunity of making his way in the world; closing the little shops in which his father made a fair living for himself and his family; absorbing one line of individual business after another; converting the successful lawyers into corporation advisers, driving the others into poorly paid clerkships; concentrating into the hands of the few the opportunities which were formerly open to the honorable competition of the many. Must the young men of the United States clerk for corporations at home, or fight for corporations in the Philippines, and see the other avenues of life gradually closed by the inexorable grip of the Trusts?

I do not believe the first voters in November, 1900, are going to stand for anything like that, or vote for any party which offers



them no better prospects for achieving success in public or private life.

This is a young country. The young men must decide its destiny. Will they cast their first votes for William Jennings Bryan, the youngest Presidential candidate of the century, young in blood, young in ambition, young in the healthy activities of life, willing to give them all a new chance in the world, representing the party of young men all over the country? I believe the new voters will answer this question in November by a tremendous majority for Bryan and Democracy.

RICHARD CROKER.

---

## V.

### THE ANTI-IMPERIALIST POSITION.

If it were not that an attitude of something like intolerance has found expression to an ominous extent among Administration partisans concerning the Anti-Imperialist movement, it would seem that the existence of an active agitation in the United States of a great public question needed no apology. De Tocqueville has only expanded the aphorism that vigilance is the price of liberty in "Democracy in America," and every student of our institutions has recognized the fact that independent and vigorous criticism is not merely permissible, but that it is the only safeguard of our liberties. Governor Roosevelt asserts, in his "Life of Benton," that the most dangerous element in the community is not what is called the criminal class, but a non-combatant class like the Quakers. The assertion is a characteristically vicious one; but the Rough Rider would be justified in the contention that, in civil affairs, the complacent and inactive citizen comes pretty near being a criminal. Nevertheless, one of the most eminent and honored citizens of a city famous for public spirit and patriotism—and it is to be feared representative of it in this as in other matters—has contented himself in the crisis of 1898-1900 with a passive attitude of acquiescence in the course of the Administration, "because the President must know more about public matters than the people, and the President can be trusted." Were such a precept generally followed, the fate of the Republic would be

justly sealed, and its citizenship would be forfeited by demonstrated unworthiness.

Whatever the result of the Anti-Imperialist cause, it will be set down in history that a generous, philanthropic and loyal movement grew up in the United States, which, in spite of bitter obloquy, artful appeals to selfishness and to every vulgar and glittering motive, and in spite of opposition by all the unscrupulous influences of a party supported by an enormous money power, has stirred the whole country and dictated the policy of a great national organization.

The momentous character of the imperial aggression transcends the issues of the Civil War, or those of any imaginable question that could be presented to a Republic. Its aim is more deadly than to rend the Republic in twain. We believe that it is to sap the sources of its life and to sow the seeds of its destruction. Its most bigoted adherent cannot minimize the fact that the addition of tropical and unassimilable peoples, in permanent colonial relations, to our Republic is the most tremendous departure conceivable from our traditions and principles and practice. No mere phrases ringing changes upon "expansion," "world power" and "destiny", can disguise the right and duty of each citizen to ponder, and decide for himself, propositions so serious and so pregnant that the attempt which has been made to forestall his judgment concerning them is in itself the grossest act of Imperialism.

The few words which follow are to treat of the historical, the legal or constitutional, the commercial-financial and the ethical aspects of the paramount question, the wrong side of which is represented by William McKinley, and the right by William Jennings Bryan.

The history of the Imperialistic movement is perfectly authenticated by official reports, by contemporaneous testimony given by those who have afterwards tried to recede from compromising positions under obvious influences, and by the evidence of civilians, officials, travellers and newspaper correspondents, sometimes by the news telegraphed and written and sometimes by the significant absence of news when the censor interposed to prevent its dispatch. Unfortunately, there are many self-contradictions in written and spoken words by persons in high places. It would

ill become a writer in these pages to accuse the President or his commanding generals or civil subordinates of falsehood. That the contradictory statements automatically accuse their authors is a circumstance beyond his control. The publications of the Anti-Imperialist League, which can be consulted by any person who desires to know the truth, have established a series of facts which will be authentic material for the future historian of the United States, whatever contemporaneous treatment they may receive.

(1.) The secret correspondence of the Government, at an early period of the war with Spain, indicated its interest in the Philippine Islands as a possession.

(2.) The dealings with Aguinaldo, as the leader of the military forces of the Filipinos, by Consul Wildman, Consul Pratt, Admiral Dewey, General Anderson and other officers and representatives of the United States, were, until the capture of Manila was effected by the co-operation of the native troops, allowed to go on, with the distinct knowledge by these officials and representatives that Aguinaldo and his people believed, and had reason to believe, that their independence was to be the result of the joint campaign, in case of its success.\*

(3.) The Philippine Government at Malolos, under an excellent constitution, was set up on September 15th, 1898, with a Congress of the chosen representatives of the Tagalog and Visayan races, embracing a large majority of the civilized tribes of the whole archipelago,† with the tacit consent of the functionaries of the United States then present in the Philippines.

(4.) A change of attitude toward the native people, their rulers and their military officers abruptly took place, in compliance with inspiration from Washington; the native launches which had been saluted by our officers when flying the Filipino flag were seized; and our lines about Manila were pressed forward, in spite of the stipulation in the protocol with Spain that the *status quo* should be sacredly respected.

(5.) The Filipinos were denied admittance to the sessions of the Peace Commission at Paris; and, though the President had at first let it be known that he intended only to ask for an island or a coaling station, he changed his instructions and caused his representatives to demand the whole archipelago, inserting the clause

\*"I never treated them as allies, except to make use of them."—Dewey.  
†Report of Senator Lodge, Chairman of the Committee on the Philippines, Fifty-Sixth Congress, first session, Senate document 171.

of the \$20,000,000 payment to Spain, to avoid the complications which might arise from the fact that we had made no conquest beyond Manila.

(6.) The opponents of the treaty in the Senate were so numerous that, though challenged to do so, the Administration did not venture to submit its ratification to a vote. The writer's presence in the Senate and in the Marble Room during these critical sessions,—laboring for the rejection of the treaty,—gives him the opportunity to offer personal testimony to the progress of events. On the night of Friday, February 3d, 1899, the Administration leaders came to the leaders of the Opposition, and virtually confessed themselves beaten by asking what form of joint resolution, declaratory of the intention of the United States to grant the Filipinos independence, would be satisfactory to them. Whatever influences might have been exerted upon Senators, a sufficient vote to defeat the ratification of the treaty seemed assured, unless such a concession were made. The White House, however, did not back up its representatives in the compromise which they had proposed. It had still another card to play. Though Senator Wellington told the writer that, "if the President would allow his private assurances of his intentions to give independence to the Filipinos to be made public", the treaty could be easily ratified, Mr. McKinley still declined to allow any such pledge to be made. Why?

(7.) While the treaty was before the Senate, the President had issued a proclamation on December 21st, 1898, ordering the immediate extension of the sovereignty of the United States and its military government "to the whole of the ceded territory."\* This proclamation, General Otis declared, was certain "to incite widespread hostilities", and he actually endeavored to suppress it and supersede it by a conciliatory address of an entirely different character. As a commentary on these transactions, the words of President McKinley at Pittsburg, August 28th, 1899, may be quoted: "Until the treaty was ratified we had no authority beyond Manila city, bay and harbor. We then had no other title to defend, no authority beyond that to maintain."

(8.) Though the original proclamation was promulgated through the misunderstanding of an inferior officer, and though an intense feeling of suspicion was aroused, while our soldiers indicated by their aggravating conduct that they were still

\*"Report of General E. S. Otis, Aug. 31st, 1899.

spoiling for a fight and still pressed back the Filipino lines,—to the everlasting credit of Aguinaldo and his army, no serious outbreak had yet occurred.

(9.) The immediate cause of the ratification of the treaty was furnished by the attack on the Filipino lines, February 4th, 1899,\* when the principal officers of the Filipino forces were absent, and the American lines sprang into action with ready equipment and instant celerity. The affair was reported to the United States Senate as an attack upon the United States forces by the Filipinos, and thus, at last, the votes needed for the ratification of the treaty were obtained.

(10.) The immediate request by the Filipino leader for an armistice and a neutral zone was refused by the United States commander,† and ever since a war has been prosecuted by the Administration, with no quarter and no hope of quarter unless through the absolute submission of a nation, once our allies against a common foe, and fighting for a liberty which we had virtually promised them, with a courage and persistence which makes them worthy of it, if any people ever were.‡

The Constitutional aspect of the imperial aggression has been discussed by many writers and speakers according to their points of view. It seems hardly necessary to controvert the extreme assertions which have been made, that the sanction of a treaty with a foreign nation can supersede the sanctions of a Constitution. The right of the Congress to dispose of territory, which has been availed of in similar cases, obviously makes it possible to transfer such sovereignty as has been acquired in the Philippine Islands to their inhabitants. The authority to retain them as territory and to govern them permanently outside of the Constitution, will doubtless be sought from the Supreme Court, as the recognition of an existing politi-

\*"Firing upon the Filipinos and the killing of one of them by the Americans, leading to return fire."—Maj.-Gen. E. S. Otis. Report up to April 6, 1899.

†Feb. 9, 1899. "Aguinaldo now applies for a cessation of hostilities and conference; have declined to answer."—Maj.-Gen. E. S. Otis's report. This statement, confirmed by General C. McReeve, has recently been denied by General Otis, who says his own "dispatch" was "misleading!"

‡"I do not think so meanly of the most unscrupulous advocate of a policy of aggression and subjugation as to doubt that, if the case were reversed, and we or he were in the place of Aguinaldo and the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands, he would resist to the last extremity and would counsel his countrymen to resist to the last extremity. But we are yet to learn of what temper these islanders are made; whether their powers of endurance are equal to their courage and their love of liberty."—Letter from the Hon. Geo. F. Hoar, March 29, 1899.

cal fact. Hitherto, the march of the Constitution, as the progress of the interpretations of that instrument has been called where doubts existed, has been enlightened by the principles of the Declaration of Independence. John Marshall, who has been justly characterized as the guide, the light and the defender of the Constitution, won his imperishable fame by the diligence with which he sought the attainment of those objects for which it is declared to have been instituted. While Marshall might not have adopted the strict construction in the Dred Scott case maintained by Judge Taney and his associates, because it involved the extension of human slavery contrary to the spirit of the instrument and of the Declaration of Independence, it can hardly be doubted that now, since this construction involves, under the changed conditions, the extension of liberty, Marshall would have to-day maintained that very construction. The survivors of those who then opposed it may now support that construction with absolute consistency. If the Supreme Court is still inspired by the spirit of its great leaders, its illumination, from the Declaration of Independence and the traditions of the Government, will enlighten its counsels so that the contentions of the present Administration will be defeated, and those arrogated powers which have been exerted with such fatal results will be overthrown. Then Porto Rico must have statehood or it must be alienated, and the Philippines must have statehood or they must be alienated.

It is a part of the Constitutional or legal aspect of the matter, that no embarrassment need be feared from possible complications involved in such a protectorate as has been suggested for the Philippines, or which might be implied by an enfranchised Porto Rico. Who can doubt that the nations of the world would accept, at the suggestion of the United States, the neutralization of these countries, as in the case of Belgium and Switzerland?

Finally, it should be noted that the Administration has never even suggested the obvious and legal method by way of amendment to the Constitution for so vast an extension of the powers of the Government, but that it has endeavored to foist upon the people a party measure, which transcends in importance any change of which its authors could have dreamed.

There are several aspects in which the commercial or financial results of tropical colonial expansion may be regarded, all equally

fatal to the specious arguments which have been exploited by the friends of the Administration.

(1.) The consideration of the balance between the cost of subjugation, now called "policing" vassal states, and any possible profit therefrom, is one of the most interesting of these. The expenses incurred on account of the Philippines are at the rate of about \$200,000,000 per annum. There is no immediate prospect of any considerable reduction in this pretty little bill. The total sum of the exports and imports of the archipelago has not exceeded \$30,000,000 a year. Let the Imperialist indicate any possible source of increase in the consuming or producing power of the islands which can overcome the frightful debit.

(2.) It is impossible to believe, after the uprising against the "scuttle" policy of the Administration in the matter of the Porto Rican tariff, that the tyrannical policy could be maintained of imposing duties to prevent colonial productions from competing with our own industries. Thus the sugar growing of tropical dependencies, promoted by our own capital, will ruin the sugar industry of the United States. The tobacco trade will, by similar means, be largely transferred to these favorable regions. Labor will be brought to the level of the standard of Asiatic living. For, even though sovereignty did not imply freedom of movement on the part of the subject peoples, the indentured labor system, a form of slavery, which English emissaries are endeavoring to induce the United States to graft upon our colonial system after the example of Great Britain, would probably sooner or later be adopted by the Imperialists.

(3.) The ultimate result of the extension of our Eastern policy to China is easily foreseen. A development of commercial opportunity in that densely populated country, to which we are pointed with such enthusiasm, means what? Not a market but a menace—the opportunity to export some tools and machinery to create Chinese industries which may soon supply the markets of the world. As Richtofen says: "The slumbering factors of an immense industrial production all exist here." There are already five large cotton mills in Shanghai. Wages average about ten cents a day, and the ready adaptiveness of the labor is indicated by the fact that productive capacity has increased twenty-five per cent. in one year. Not prosperity but ruin and disaster are the auguries of expansion.

The ethical side of a condition which has followed avoidable war need only, it might be supposed, be calmly contemplated to arouse the conscience of the whole nation in vehement opposition. In Cuba, a population on the verge of revolution; a broken and bitter subject race in Porto Rico; in the Philippines, a defiant and persistent enemy. Corruption in the Administration, horrible licensed vice in Manila, the outrages of an irregular contest beyond even the cruel laws of war and the chartered savagery of barbarous allies, the treatment of Catholic Christians as heathens, the desecration of churches, rapine, ravishing and murder; in what a horrible propaganda of wickedness the United States has been engaged for months, which are now gathering up their dread account into years. This explains the censorship which keeps the truth from America. While all these horrors are going on, because they do not come within reach of the senses, the defenders of the Administration rely upon the comfort and prosperity which are as yet superficially apparent in domestic affairs to dull the ears and steel the hearts of the American people. It is the old Imperial idea that nothing matters while there is a plenty of bread and circuses. It is impossible that we should long remain thus callous; but, even should we otherwise do so, there is reason to expect that the inflation of a vastly expanded currency is about to collapse, and that wages, which have not now the purchasing power of four years ago, will be reduced or cut off, and that bad times will arouse the people to the wrong which is being done at home and abroad.

As for the bogie which the Republican party is trying to manufacture out of the corpse embalmed in the Democratic Platform, it may be said that, if it has any living menace, the mind which could place the Silver Issue in the same plane with or above the issue of Imperialism would have sacrificed the Union in the war between the States, rather than have risked the depression of the currency.

President McKinley, as Governor Boutwell has eloquently said, was given "an opportunity for the enrollment of his name with that of the Czar of Russia, who emancipated millions of hereditary serfs; with the name of Lincoln, a name that can never die; with the name of the Emperor of Brazil, who struck the shackles from the last slave on the American continent. Presi-



dent McKinley could have said to the inhabitants of Porto Rico and the Philippines: "We have acquired the title of Spain, such as it is; but your title, by possession, is the better title. We are prepared to surrender the Spanish title to you. The yoke of Imperialism is broken. Organize free governments and prepare to found free states, and thus to create happy and prosperous commonwealths."

He has refused the great opportunity. "And this is the writing that was written,—'Mene, Mene, Tekel, Upharsin'."

ERVING WINSLOW.

---

## VI.

### THE VITAL ISSUES OF THE CAMPAIGN.

THE crucial issue of this Presidential campaign is, whether we shall keep or lose our present prosperity at home and our new gains and prestige abroad. We know what we now have. We know that a change of Administration would reverse our existing policies, both domestic and foreign, and overturn their results. The decisive question of the hour is whether the American people want such a change.

There are many broad differences between the policies and purposes of the two great parties, as now led. They touch the sanctity of the courts, the power inherent in nationality, the efficiency of a protective tariff, and various other subjects. But, while other matters are at stake and will be affected by the result, the battle this year is waged over two central and conclusive questions. First: Shall we maintain the existing gold standard, with business confidence and stability, or shall we change to the silver standard, with an immediate and inevitable financial convulsion? Second: Shall we fulfill the duties and responsibilities and preserve the advantages which have come to us with the expansion of our country, or shall we renounce the obligations of our victories and abandon all that we have gained?

Whatever other phases may be suggested, whatever sidelights may be thrown on the contest, the vital struggle turns on these two salient and overshadowing propositions. The paramount issue of a campaign is determined, not by the assertion of any candidate or convention, but by the obvious effect of the election

and the relative importance of its results in their bearing on the welfare of the people. It is fixed, not by declarations, but by events and consequences. We measure issues by practical tests. We knew and felt the hard times from 1893 to 1897. We know and feel the good times since. Both conditions were and are visible, tangible and palpable. They are within the consciousness of every man. They have directly affected every man's interest and well-being.

We hear a great deal about "Imperialism" as a paramount issue, but who sees it or feels it as we see and feel hard times or good times? Whatever it is, it is already here, according to the phantom-fanciers; it has been here ever since our flag waved over the new possessions; with such Cæsarism actually oppressing us, we ought to know it and groan under it. But, as a matter of fact, are there any real evils which men are suffering from it, and of which they are so conscious that, in order to escape these evils, they are ready for business panic and calamity? The supporters of President McKinley point to a real, living, unparalleled prosperity, and contend that the success of their opponents would blight it and bring disaster. The supporters of Mr. Bryan point to an imaginary "Imperialism," and contend that the success of their opponents would continue it. Would the continuance of this spectre, whatever it may be, have any such direct and vital bearing on the immediate interests, happiness and welfare of the people as a change from good times to hard times? Which, then, is the paramount issue?

If Mr. Bryan's election would produce the result of overturning our existing prosperity, this question manifestly transcends all others in importance. If any issue he represents involves that effect, it is plainly paramount, whether called so or not. No other question, significant as it may be, can approach in supreme consequence that of preserving the general well-being, content and success of the great body of the people. Now, our present prosperity can be wrecked and general disaster produced, either by the actual adoption of the silver standard or by such menace and fear of its adoption as would destroy confidence. Mr. Bryan was defeated in 1896 because the country realized that his election would bring in free silver and the silver standard, with its destruction of confidence, its unsettlement of values, its paralysis of enterprise and industry, and its universal losses. He

holds to the same policy now, and, in the event of his election, what is to prevent the same result?

He publicly declares that the gold standard shall not remain, if he is able to get rid of it. If he is honest and sincere in the convictions he has expressed for years, he is bound to make warfare on the gold standard. The way for attack is just as clear now as it was in 1896, except for the currency law passed last winter. That is the only obstacle to the silver standard which did not exist when Mr. Bryan was running before. It is an effective barrier in the hands of an Administration that wants to make it such. But it is only a statutory enactment, capable of being amended by another Congress, or of being neutralized by an unfriendly Administration. A popular current strong enough to elect Mr. Bryan would inevitably elect a Bryan House of Representatives. It would carry States with Senatorial elections pending that would assure a close and doubtful Senate. A President aggressively for the free coinage of silver at sixteen to one and an uncertain and plastic Congress would make it an imminent danger. Even if Congress did nothing, a compliant Secretary of the Treasury, agreeing with Mr. Bryan and obedient to his directions, could pay coin obligations in silver and practically paralyze the statute. Law does not enforce itself. It is inert unless executed. A hostile and ineffective Administration makes it a dead letter.

But the deadly effect would be felt without waiting for direct action. The menace and fear of the silver standard, even before its accomplishment, would blight our prosperity. The election of Mr. Bryan would at once excite that alarm. He has publicly announced that he would summon the new Congress in extra session immediately on taking his seat. If he were elected in November, the country would know that, in four months, the Pandora's box of evils of a silver President and a dubious Congress would be opened. The uncertainty and apprehension thus created would destroy the general sense of confidence and security. Nobody would know what to count on. Confidence is the vital breath of trade and enterprise. Destroy confidence, and you undermine the foundation of men's dealings. Values would tumble, panic would come, and widespread disaster would follow.

And it must not be overlooked that the disaster would be greater now than it would have been in 1896. It is the character-

istic of human nature, long associated with possible perils, to minimize them and lose its dread. Pompeii, familiar with the terrors of Vesuvius, ceased to fear until the fiery avalanche came. The submersion and destruction of Galveston from a tornado and a tidal wave had long been predicted, but years of escape had bred thoughtlessness of the danger. Johnstown grew and prospered and lived merrily under an overhanging reservoir, but at last the cataclysm overtook it. In 1896, the menace of the silver standard, with all its perils, was new and startled the country. The awakened sense of a great possible catastrophe put us on guard, and it was warded off. That escape, and continued familiarity with a threat which did not eventuate, have served to benumb and deaden the general sense of danger; but, in reality, the calamity of Mr. Bryan's election, with the consequent financial convulsion and business distress, would be far severer now than it would have been in 1896.

The reason is that we have more to lose. We have farther to fall. We should be plunged to the same depths from a higher altitude. In 1896, we had already suffered four years of hard times and low prices. Widespread bankruptcy, universal depression and a general fall of values had brought us down toward the silver level. We should have dropped, but dropped from a low plane. On the other hand, if we fall now we shall fall from a loftier height with more disastrous results. Prices, values, securities, wages are all far higher than they were in 1896. They are on the recognized and accepted gold level, with the buoyancy of unprecedented prosperity, and a fall to the silver level would produce an immeasurable shock. The sudden realization of such a possibility through Mr. Bryan's election would immediately shatter confidence, and cause the greatest financial convulsion the country has ever seen. Our markets are more closely connected with those of Europe than ever before. With our present splendid financial standing we have become a creditor nation. The Powers of Europe are coming to us for large loans. The upheaval of our markets by the threat of the silver standard would convulse the Bourses of London, Paris and Berlin, which would react here, and the sweeping extent of the financial, business and industrial calamity would be beyond calculation.

In domestic affairs, therefore, the vital issue of the campaign is between the gold standard and the silver standard, between

prosperity and panic. In the very nature of the case, because it directly touches the daily life and well-being of every man, woman and child in the country, this issue must overshadow all others in practical importance. When we pass to the questions which have grown out of the Spanish war and of the resulting territorial acquisitions, the attitudes of the two candidates are equally distinct, and the conclusion must be equally decisive. These questions are substantially concentrated in the discussion over the Philippines. President McKinley recognizes the duty of maintaining our sovereignty and giving the people of the islands self-government as fast as they are prepared for it. He follows Jefferson's course in Louisiana and Monroe's in Florida. Mr. Bryan, on the other hand, proposes to abandon our sovereignty, to set up a supreme government of Aguinaldo and his followers, to recognize its independence, and to maintain its independence and authority against domestic violence and foreign aggression by an American protectorate.

Here are two distinct, sharply defined plans of procedure. What they involve must, under limitations of space, be stated in few words. President McKinley's plan holds what we have gained; maintains our authority, which is recognized by all of the outside world and accepted by all of the Filipinos, except a small and diminishing band of insurgents whose insurrection will cease the moment he is re-elected; requires no additional but a decreasing force; and develops the inhabitants into self-rule. Mr. Bryan's plan surrenders the only authority now existing in the islands; undertakes to establish the rule of Aguinaldo; precipitates a bloody conflict among the inharmonious tribes, which, while bowing to us, will not recognize each other's dominance; leaves the islands open to foreign complications and aggression; and, after giving a free hand to the Filipinos, commits us to protect them against these inevitable dangers. Mr. Bryan's idea, as indicated both in his earlier speech and in his recent letter of acceptance, is to protect them by the Monroe doctrine. This shows an astonishing confusion of mind. The Monroe doctrine is a policy framed for the protection of this hemisphere and limited to the American half of the world. Europe recognizes and respects it, because it is confined to the two Americas. Undertake to extend it to Europe or Asia or Africa, and it would break down here. In assuming to apply it for the protection of

the Philippines, Mr. Bryan would destroy its force for the protection of America.

Besides thus dealing the deadliest blow at the Monroe doctrine through its complete misconception and misapplication, his policy would equally approach the militarism and imperialism he professes to abhor. There is no imperialism in lawfully maintaining our rightful sovereignty, as we do in Alaska. There is no militarism in suppressing revolt against our authority, as we do in Arizona. But, in undertaking to set up the government of another power where we had expressly surrendered sovereignty and title, Mr. Bryan's policy involves imperial prerogative. And in assuming responsibility for Aguinaldo's administration, while abdicating all authority of our own, it would require a far larger force than is needed to maintain our existing rights, and would give an exhibit of militarism. His policy for the Philippines is as fatal as his policy of free silver.

CHARLES EMORY SMITH.

---

## VII.

### PRESIDENT MCKINLEY OR PRESIDENT BRYAN?

The American people have come to know that each of the candidates for the Presidency is a man of strong and forceful personality. The notion that either is a man of weak intelligence, or uncertain will, controlled by some stronger nature, has gone by. President McKinley has not only been Chief Executive of the United States for nearly four years, but he has been Chief Executive in his own mind. I was told—what I do not doubt in the least—by an eminent Senator who was at one time popularly supposed to make up the President's mind for him every morning, that he had been to the White House to talk politics with the President but twice during the whole winter, except on such local matters as all Senators are consulted about, and that, in many of his visits to the President in leisure hours, politics or public affairs were not mentioned at all. President McKinley has exerted a large personal force, concealed in a quiet courtesy of manner, and tempered by great kindness of heart and considerate respect for other men, ever since he entered the public service as a young soldier during the War of the Rebellion.

It is but the idlest folly to deny that Mr. Bryan, who, in a single speech, took by storm the National Convention of a great party then full of an exultant, though vain, hope of triumph, compelled it to discard all its old leaders and to adopt him and his theories, and who, after one signal defeat, has maintained himself not merely as a leader, but a dictator, in spite of the remonstrances of the wisest, ablest and most popular of the party chieftains, is possessed of a strong will, a vigorous understanding, and an earnest and steadfast purpose. Without being President, he has twice compelled the Democratic party to take him as a candidate, and dictated a platform setting forth his own opinions, or the doctrines he thinks will command success for him in his political aspirations. If he shall be President, he will compel his party to renominate him again on such a platform as he shall think fit. There have been Presidential elections in which the personal quality of the candidate made little difference, except as he might happen to have more or less the gift of attracting votes. Pierce would have done pretty much the same thing as Buchanan did, and Buchanan as Pierce did. Monroe would have done pretty much the same thing as Madison. Sherman would have done pretty much the same thing as Harrison. Seymour would have done pretty much the same thing as McClellan. But each of the candidates this year not only means to be elected President if he can, but means to be President himself after he is elected.

There are two classes of men whose minds are made up. I will not say that all argument will be thrown away upon them. But all arguments I can make would be thrown away upon them. One is the zealous partisan, who follows party wherever it leads. To him the party and its President, or its candidate for the Presidency, are what the Holy Father and the Church are to the devout Catholic. He has no opinion of his own. He looks to his party to furnish his platform and political leader, as the zealous devotee of the Church looks to it alike for doctrine and for spiritual guide.

The other class comprehends a great variety of men—Populists, Socialists, Anarchists—men who think the free coinage of silver a panacea for all sorrows; men who have a special crotchet which they think will reconstruct society. To neither of these, nor to the thorough Democratic partisan, is it worth while to address political discussion now.

There are two classes of men open to argument. Many of them are still undecided. If they unite to support Mr. McKinley, it will make his election sure.

First, there is the conservative Democrat. He is probably a free-trader, unless, as is quite apt to be the case, he is himself engaged in a protected industry. He has no faith in the National authority to protect the negro, or to secure fair elections. He has been a Democrat always, as was his father before him, unless possibly he may be the son of a Hunker Whig who opposed the war and the Constitutional amendments. He has a general dislike of Republican ways and Republican leaders. But he believes in public honesty, in sound finance, in the authority of the Supreme Court; and he has no sort of respect for Mr. Bryan, for Populism, or Socialism, and does not wish to risk the safety of his investments, or the value of his comfortable property. He is doubting whether it is not better to continue Republican power for another term, and calmly bear the ills we have, than to fly to those we know not of, under Mr. Bryan. He hopes, also, that if Bryan be thoroughly defeated once more, the Democratic party may be purified, and be fit again for his support. I think he will vote for McKinley, or he will not vote at all. But he will not look to me for counsel, and I have nothing in the way of argument adapted to persuade him.

The other man in doubt is the Anti-Imperialist Republican. He has been saying all his life that all men are created equal in political rights, and that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. He thinks the United States have no right to hold vassals or subjects. He is a great expansionist; but the expansion he believes in is the extension of the country by adding new States and enlarging the population of freemen. He believes there is such a thing as Imperialism, in spite of the disclaimer of his Republican friends. When anybody says the Philippine Islands are ours, he understands that to be Imperialism, and he replies, "The Philippine Islands belong to the Philippine people." When anybody says, "We will establish for them such good government as we think they are fit for," he answers, "That is Imperialism. They are entitled to establish for themselves such government as they think good and fit for themselves." That he calls Anti-Imperialism. He is considering just now, painfully and sorrowfully, whether he will



vote the Republican ticket or no. Perhaps he will listen to a few suggestions before he decides. To him I wish to appeal.

First. Either William McKinley or William J. Bryan is to be the next President. Unless you vote for one or the other, you will vote in the air. You may as well leave your vote with the census officer, or with the grocer, as with the election officer, unless you vote for one or the other of these two men.

Now, some things have happened in the past which, however you regard them, cannot be helped now. The treaty with Spain has been ratified. We have had eighteen months of war in the Philippine Islands. Instead of another Japan, taking its high rank among the powers of the earth; instead of Cuba, sending its youth to our shores, grateful to us as their liberators from centuries of oppression, to sit docile learners at our feet, we have a sullen, angry and shattered people. Whatever has caused all this, whether it was a mistake, or whether it was the inevitable cost of the discharge of a great duty, we cannot help it now. We have to deal with the future.

Now, the only question for the Republican Anti-Imperialist is, whether the chance that Mr. Bryan and the Democrats will do what the Republican Anti-Imperialist thinks should be done in the future, which will not be done by Mr. McKinley and the Republicans, is worth the price he is to pay for it if he votes for Mr. Bryan. It is not whether we should instantly withdraw from the Philippine Islands; it is not whether the abandonment of our claim to hold them in subjection be worth accomplishing at the cost of national bankruptcy, or financial distress, at the cost of free trade and the ruin of our manufactures, at the cost of repeating again the nightmare of Democratic administration. If we concede that we are willing to go through with that, if we can only get back to the Declaration of Independence again, still that is not the important question now. The important question now is: Is there anything that Mr. Bryan can be trusted to do about it that is worth the cost of giving him the power to do what he will do, if he can, in other matters?

Now, let us understand exactly the price we are asked to pay, and then let us understand exactly what reasonable hope there is that Mr. Bryan can or will accomplish anything for the independence of the Philippine people, if he be elected. You agree, my friend, that the free coinage of silver at 16 to 1 means

national dishonor, great injury to business, the reduction by half of all savings, the destruction of the standard of value—making all business transactions gambling transactions, and a great reduction, not only of the savings of the wage-earner, but of the wages he is to earn hereafter. Now, can Mr. Bryan put us on a silver basis, and will he? He says he will, and he says he can.

At Knoxville, Tenn., Sept. 16, 1896, he said: "If there is any one who believes the gold standard is a good thing, or that it must be maintained, I warn him not to cast his vote for me, because I promise him it will not be maintained in this country longer than I am able to get rid of it."

And at Topeka, when he accepted the Populists' nomination the other day, he told them:

"No Populist, however sanguine, believes it possible to elect a Populist President at this time, but the Populist party may be able to determine whether a Democrat or a Republican will be elected.

"If the fusion forces win a victory this fall, we shall see the reform accomplished"—he was speaking of monetary reform—"before the next Presidential election, and with its accomplishment the people will find it easier to secure any remedial legislation which they may desire."

He means to do just that thing. He believes he can do it by Executive power, and believes, as he says, that "with its accomplishment the people will find it easier to secure any remedial legislation which they may desire." Monetary reform first, remedial legislation next, is what he promises to do.

Mr. Secretary Gage says he can do it, and that he can do it by the exercise of the lawful power now lodged in the Executive. Some people think Mr. Gage is mistaken in his conception of the extent of the Executive power under existing laws. But whether he be mistaken or no, have you any doubt that Mr. Bryan agrees with him, and that he will not hesitate to do what he now promises to do, what he has the great authority of the Republican Secretary of the Treasury for saying that he can lawfully do? You think to do it means national dishonor and business ruin. So you are to pay national dishonor and business ruin as part only of the cost of getting a President **who now** professes to agree with you about the Philippine Islands.

Now, in four Southern States, by an ingenious device, they have undertaken to legalize the disfranchisement of the negro, and to overturn all the Constitutional amendments. Two other States are about doing the same thing. If they succeed, there can be no question that the same thing will be done in every other Southern State, with one or two possible exceptions. Now, with that accomplished, there will be disfranchised ten million American citizens at home. It will give the Southern white Democrats fifty or sixty Representatives, and the same number of votes in the Electoral College, not dependent upon numbers, and representing sheer usurpation. It will not only disfranchise ten million American citizens in the Southern States, whose numbers are, of course, to increase with every census, but it will disfranchise to that extent the free white citizens of the North. In every future election, the Republican party of the North is to play against Tammany Hall and the Southern Democracy, and the latter will hold these loaded dice. It may be that we cannot baffle the purpose which has already been so far accomplished. But the express mandate of the Constitution is that in such case the representation of the offending States shall be proportionately diminished. I am not now waving the bloody shirt. I am not now reviving the old issues. I am not now talking about election laws, or laws for the suppression of violence. I am simply calling your attention to the question, whether you mean to be disfranchised yourselves, and to have fifty or sixty Southern Democratic Representatives in the national House of Representatives to vote you down for the indefinite future. Now, nobody will dream for a moment that, if Bryan and the Democratic party shall come into power, this Constitutional mandate will be obeyed. And you, a Republican; you, a friend of equality; you, who believe that governments derive their just power from the consent of the governed; you, who believe that all men are equal in political rights; you, who mean that your government, at least, shall rest on your own consent, and that you are yourself equal in political rights to the best Southern Democrat that ever trod the country's soil—are asked to sustain this thing in the next Presidential election by your vote, because Mr. William J. Bryan says he is in favor of justice and freedom and independence in the Far East.

Another thing: I agree that it is not equal in importance

to the two considerations I have stated. You have believed that the prosperity of the American workman, and of the American employer, the prosperity of labor and capital alike, the comfort of the workman's home, the independence of American manufacture, depend on our protective system for which you have been working and voting ever since you came to manhood. Will Mr. Bryan and his party have learned anything by experience? They are pledged to overthrow that if they can, and they ask you, without disguise of their purpose, to help them to overthrow that, if they can.

Another thing: Mr. Bryan stands in 1900 on the platform of 1896. He will, if he can, fill the Supreme Court of the United States, whose membership is now largely composed of old men, with judges of his way of thinking. You are to commit to him that august tribunal, which has been our rock of defense and our ark of safety so often. When you bring a President into power, you bring with him into power, as his counsellors, the men who have been his political companions and advisers, and who have contributed most to his elevation. I will not name names. But the intelligent Republican who is hesitating as to his duty now, knows very well who are the active and efficient Bryan men, South and North, East and West. Whom will he consult in Massachusetts? Whom will he consult in New York city and State? Whom will he consult, whose advice will he take, in the West, and in the South? Mr. Tillman, of South Carolina, of whom I have no word of disrespect, reported the Democratic platform to the Convention at Kansas City. He is, I think, an honest, manly and able statesman. He has a marvellous gift of racy speech. He has become the dominant power in his own State and section, where he overthrew the old Democratic leaders, like Hampton and Butler, with one hand, and put the Republican majority of his State under his feet with the other. This is what he said last winter in the Senate. The terrible, tragic meaning of his words is almost forgotten in our admiration for the manly frankness of the avowal.

"We took the government away. We stuffed ballot boxes. We shot them. We are not ashamed of it. The Senator from Wisconsin would have done the same thing. I see it in his eye right now. He would have done it. With that system—force, tissue ballots, etc.—we got tired ourselves. So we called a constitutional convention, and we

eliminated, as I said, all of the colored people whom we could under the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments.

"I want to call your attention to the remarkable change that has come over the spirit of the dream of the Republicans; to remind you, gentlemen from the North, that your slogans of the past—brotherhood of man and fatherhood of God—have gone glimmering down the ages. The brotherhood of man exists no longer, because you shoot negroes in Illinois, when they come in competition with your labor, as we shoot them in South Carolina, when they come in competition with us in the matter of elections. You do not love them any better than we do. You used to pretend that you did; but you no longer pretend it, except to get their votes.

"You deal with the Filipinos just as we deal with the negroes, only you treat them a heap worse."\*

Now, if you elect Mr. Bryan, the one most powerful force in Mr. Bryan's counsel at the South will be Mr. Tillman, the rising young leader of the powerful Democracy of that section, as in New York it will be Richard Croker, who has been faithful to Mr. Bryan and to his principles from the beginning, and who is the political despot of the Empire State. There are twenty million human beings, whose rights as freemen are at stake—ten million at home and ten million abroad. Will you consent to put your heel on the ten million at home, and, standing on their prostrate liberties, proclaim liberty to the nations of the world? You believe Mabini and Aguinaldo fit for self-government. So do I. You believe that Booker Washington is fit for self-government. So do I. Shall we—as Mr. Bryan and the Democratic party do, as Mr. Bryan and his Mugwump and Independent supporters do—strangle Booker Washington with one hand, and wave the flag over the head of Aguinaldo with the other?

This is the price, or a part of the price, you are to pay. You are to commit all the unknown questions of the unknown future to Mr. Bryan and his Democratic allies, if you elect him to power. What sort of statesmanship do you think they will furnish, to deal with great questions that now confront us?

Abraham Lincoln said in 1864 that it was not a good plan to swap horses while crossing the stream. Is it a good plan to swap horses while crossing the dangerous and stormy Chinese sea in a typhoon? What are you to get in the way of an equivalent for the terrible price you are asked to pay? You remember Dr. Franklin's story—trite as the a-b-c or the multiplica-

\*Congressional Record, February 26, 1900, pp. 2,347-2,348.

tion table; yet we may well repeat it, since the wit of man cannot improve it—of the boy who paid too dear for his whistle. Will you get anything from Mr. Bryan, except a whistle?

It is said by some of our friends that we wish to punish President McKinley and the Republican party for the great wrong they have committed. Which deserves being punished the more, President McKinley and the Republicans who made the treaty, and who voted for it, believing that the Philippine people were semi-civilized, incapable of self-government, sure to fall an easy prey to the ambition or greed of foreign nations, or wear themselves out in domestic strife, or Mr. Bryan, who, thinking as we do, by his personal influence caused the treaty to be ratified? You and I think Mr. McKinley and the Republicans who supported the treaty were all wrong in their belief. But the President negotiated the treaty, and the Senate gave its consent. Now, what did Mr. Bryan do? He thought the people of the Philippine Islands were entitled to govern themselves. He thought we had no Constitutional power to govern them. He thought that to undertake that government was to convert this Government into an Empire. He thought it was to do infinite mischief to our citizenship, and infinite wrong to the people we were to subjugate. Now, so believing, Mr. Bryan came to Washington and stabbed the cause of Anti-Imperialism in the back in the hour of its assured victory. The treaty would have been beaten, almost by a majority; at any rate, with a very large vote to spare. Mr. Bryan put forth all his power as a great political leader—the last candidate of his party for the Presidency, certain to be its next candidate—to secure the adoption of this treaty which contained and wrought, as he believed, all these evils. I will not discuss his motive. But I cannot think of any good rational explanation, except that, knowing very well that he was more likely to be beaten on them in a time of prosperity, he wished to keep this question alive for the campaign.

The Senate was the West Point of the resistance to Imperialism. It could not be captured unless the forces of one side outnumbered the forces of the other two to one. It was as if some great General and great political leader in the Revolution had surrendered West Point to the British enemy, and had induced the Continental Congress to declare by vote that George III. was the lawful sovereign, and the British Parliament the lawful legis-

lature for the American Colonies. That vote made it the Constitutional duty of the President to reduce the Philippine Islands to subjection, and to restore order and peace. From that duty he could be relieved only by an act of Congress, requiring the assent of Senate and House, and his own Constitutional approval—an assent and approval which Mr. Bryan then knew full well it was utterly preposterous to expect.

Mr. Justice Grier, giving the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States, in the Prize Cases, 2 Black, 665, declared that although the President cannot initiate or declare war, he is bound to take care that the laws be faithfully executed, and that by the acts of Congress of February 28, 1795, and March 3, 1807, he is authorized to call out the military and naval forces of the United States to suppress insurrection against the Government of the United States; and that although he does not initiate war, he is bound to accept the challenge without waiting for any special legislative authority, and must himself decide whether, in fulfilling his duty in suppressing an insurrection, he is met with such armed resistance as will compel him to give them the character of belligerent, and that this is a question to be decided *by him*.

Mr. Justice Nelson adds: The whole military and naval power of the United States is put under the President's control to meet such an emergency. There was some dissent as to other parts of the opinion. But in this opinion the Court was unanimous. These two judges were distinguished Democrats, and upon the Court sat at the time Taney and Catron and Clifford.

In *American Insurance Co. v. Canter*, 1 Peters, 511, Chief Justice Marshall says: "The Constitution confers absolutely on the government . . . the power of acquiring territory, either by conquest or by *treaty*. . . . If it be ceded by treaty, the acquisition is confirmed, and the ceded territory becomes a part of the nation to which it is annexed, either on the terms stipulated in the treaty of cession, or on such as its new master shall impose."

The treaty, whose adoption Mr. Bryan procured, by putting forth his whole power to secure it, declared the people of the Philippine Islands subjects of the United States. It made their warfare insurrection against the Government of the United States. It made it the Constitutional duty of the President to put that

insurrection down. It also affirmed and exercised the power of the United States to purchase sovereignty over ten million people for money, pledged the faith of the country for payment and promised that Congress, and not the people concerned, should dispose of their future. All these things Mr. Bryan helped to do. He is more responsible for them than any other man in the country, since the treaty left the hands of the Executive. When you punish President McKinley and the Republican party for what they did, you punish the country and you punish yourself. Do you not think Mr. Bryan and his seventeen followers who voted for the treaty deserve a little punishment also? You can inflict that by saving and benefiting the country, without endangering it in any degree.

Mr. Bryan says he thought the mischief would be cured by the passage of the Bacon resolution affirming our purpose to give that people self-government hereafter. Mr. Bryan, it seems to me, must have known that the passage of such a resolution was quite improbable, and that, if it had passed the Senate, it would have been of no vigor or effect whatever, a mere idle resolve, without any Constitutional potency, unless it were agreed to by the House and approved by the President. The treaty became the law of the land by the express terms of the Constitution. A treaty is greater than a common statute, because it not only is the law of the land, but it pledges the faith of the American people. Now, how idle for a gentleman aspiring to the great office of the Presidency to say: "Oh, yes, I made it the law of the land that it was the duty of Congress to govern the people of the Philippine Islands; I bought them and paid for them; I pledged the faith of the Government that this thing should be done, and that this thing should be done in this way, and I trusted to the chance hereafter that one House of Congress alone might pass a resolution that they did not mean to keep on in that policy."

But Mr. Bryan says he wanted to get the matter out of the hands of the President, and into the hands of Congress. Now, in the first place, his whole theory was and is that the Philippine Islands is a matter with which Congress has rightfully or Constitutionally nothing to do; and, in the second place, the method he took was not calculated to take the matter out of the hands of the President or to put it into the hands of Congress.



But he says he wanted to get peace with Spain, and he did not want to run the risk of making amendments to the treaty to which Spain might not consent. But he knew very well then that the war with Spain was over. Her fleets were shattered, her armies were captive, she had sued for peace, and her Commissioners had said to the people of the United States in express words, "We are in your power, and Spain is compelled to accede to any terms you may dictate." How idle is any suggestion that Spain would not gladly have acquiesced in an amendment of the treaty which put the Philippine Islands on the same footing with the people of Cuba. A cable dispatch would have brought the eager consent of Spain to such an amendment in twenty-four hours.

But Mr. Bryan says that if the treaty had been defeated, then the President would have called, after the next 4th of March, an extra session of the Senate, in which the Republican majority would have been larger, and would have secured its ratification then. I do not believe it. That would have required a delay of several months, and if Mr. Bryan had exercised his influence as a political leader against the treaty, instead of in its favor, the two-thirds majority would never have been commanded for it.

But, talking of what the Senate would have done at its extra session, can Mr. Bryan doubt that if he had got through his resolution, which failed, that it would have been repealed in six weeks? A treaty is the law of the land, as I have said, and pledges the faith of the Government. The Senate cannot abrogate it, if it would; and it will be a rare case when Congress and the President will undertake to abrogate it, if they can. But this empty resolution of Brother Bryan's, if a majority had been for it, and not against it, as it was, he knows as well as I do, and his supporters know as well as you do, would have been doomed to a life of less than six weeks, if it had ever been adopted.

If you look at Mr. Bryan's promises as to silver, you will not find them vague and unmeaning. He does not say, when he talks about his financial schemes, that he shall call an extra session of Congress, and hopes they will do something. He says the thing will be done. He means business.

If you analyze Mr. Bryan's assurances in regard to the Philippine Islands, they do not differ much, practically, as to the future, from those of the present Administration. In everything else we

have got the same Mr. Bryan and the same Democratic party. If the Democratic campaign of 1896 was, as we all believed and styled it then, "a passionate crusade of dishonor," is it any less a passionate crusade of dishonor now? Will the policy which would have overthrown the public credit then not overthrow it now? Will the policy which brought suffering into the homes of the American workingman in 1892 fail to accomplish the same result in 1900? Will the ring of a dishonest dollar, or the outcry against the disgrace of a broken promise, please the ear any better in the new century than in the old?

Have the laws of trade, and the maxims of finance, and the Constitutional rights of American citizens; has the authority and supremacy of law; has the character of Tammany Hall; have the purposes of the old Democratic leaders—changed in four years?

My zealous friend, the old story will repeat itself again. The Southern Democrat will hold you as fish to his hook as long as he wants you, and then he will toss you back, half dead, into the sea.

You and I think that the Republican party, whatever mistakes it has made, has been true to freedom and justice and righteousness in the past. The men who have composed it, and who still compose it, have wrought everything for justice and righteousness and freedom that has been wrought in this country for half a century.

It has made, in my judgment, one great mistake. But with these two parties standing side by side, promising justice and good government to this Oriental people, I trust the party that has made but one mistake, rather than the party whose sole existence has been a mistake. I prefer the Government which the Republican party has established at home, to the Governments which the Democratic party has established and has sought to establish at home. I prefer freedom and justice and equality and local self-government after the pattern of New England and Massachusetts, rather than after the pattern of Mississippi and South Carolina. I like the gospel according to McKinley better than the gospel according to Bryan. I do not believe that Mr. Bryan or his associates will do better for ten million people of another race in the Philippine Islands than they have done and mean to do for ten million American citizens in the United States. I have an assured hope, and an assured and confident faith, that this matter, in spite of the mistakes of the past, will yet be

wrought out in accordance with the old principles of the American people and the old principles of the Republican party. I thought we ought to deal with the people of the Philippine Islands as we dealt with the people of Cuba. It was a mistake not to do so. But that having been done which was done, the war having gone on, the next thing to do is to establish peace; and peace being established, if that people prove intelligent and fit for self-government, actually governing themselves in freedom and in honor, and if they desire independence, they have the right to independence; and if I know the American people, if I know the Republican party, the people of the Philippines will find no obstacle to their independence in the power of the American Republic.

GEORGE F. HOAR.

---

### VIII.

#### THE COST OF A BLUNDER.

THERE are several reasons why it is more important than usual in Presidential elections that American citizens should vote right next month. Ordinarily, the Democrat and the Republican, recognizing the necessity of party alignment, can each vote his own ticket conscientiously, with a reasonable assurance that he is doing his duty to his country. Government by party is as much a part of our American administrative system as if it were embodied in the Constitution. No practical man can conceive of a method of carrying on the affairs of the Federal, State and municipal organizations without responsible heads, to whom the people can look for efficiency and integrity.

Party organizations furnish the people with their only means of enforcing this responsibility. That one of the two great parties which happens to be in power can be punished by the citizens for the misdeeds of its chosen representatives only by voting for those of the Opposition party. In the same way, the party in power can be rewarded for good service by continuing its chosen representatives in office. These are the alternatives usually presented in Presidential elections.

On November 7th, 1900, the electors of the United States will have quite a different and a vastly more important problem presented for their decision at the polls. The duty of American

citizens to put patriotism above politics at this time, and to vote for the best interests of the whole country, seems to me to be unusually clear. The considerations leading to this conclusion it ought not to be difficult to state. The situation is an extraordinary one. When a man's house is threatened by fire, he does not stop the firemen to ask if they are members of his lodge, or whether they entertain the same views as he does about the tariff or the income tax. In the presence of the graver peril, minor issues are lost sight of. Self-preservation is the first law of nations as well as of individuals.

It is my firm conviction that the vast majority of the voters of the United States will, within a year, have abundant and unmistakable evidence, in their homes, shops, counting-houses and offices, that their decision at the polls this fall gave the United States the greatest impetus it has ever received toward its goal; or, contrariwise, its greatest setback.

For, in the 124 years that have elapsed since the Declaration of Independence, the two parties have never offered the voter so startling a choice. In the face of approaching dissolution, a sick man may contravene the precedents of a long life of well-being and consent to the most critical experiment. But to a healthy man, the suggestion of a desperate and radical departure from all he holds sane and prudent must come as little short of the diabolical.

The American nation is in the hey-day of life and usefulness. It has just passed through a period of four years of absolutely unexampled prosperity. Abroad, it has achieved a place among the Powers of civilization, which surpasses the fondest aspirations a reasonable American could have entertained, when McKinley and Bryan first entered the political lists as antagonists. At home, it has strengthened the confidence of industrious capital and widened the horizon of remunerative labor to a point never before attained. Now, it follows that a vote for McKinley and Roosevelt is not only a vote of confidence in the men who, as the agents of the people, have brought this prosperity about, but it is also a declaration that this, of all others, is no time for dangerous experiments with our national finances—the rock-bottom basis of all our prosperity.

The ship of state is sailing along the high seas, in the sunshine, with the Stars and Stripes floating proudly from her top-

most mast, with all the countries of the world welcoming her to new havens, with McKinley at the helm, after four years of honorable and successful experience. There are no clouds on the horizon, no rocks on the chart, save such as he is best equipped to steer clear of. The Bryanized Democracy is seeking to board the ship of state, at this juncture, with the deliberate intention of running her out of her course, out of the course of the world's commerce, to a quicksand of free silver on a desert island.

The commercial agencies of the world now rate the United States "A1." She pays her debts at home and her debts abroad in the same coin. Her rating is the result of a steadfast adherence to the gold standard, to which the Republican party was significantly committed in the St. Louis Convention in 1896. Any doubts in the minds of reasonable men as to the wisdom of this course, must have been long since resolved. The unqualified adherence of the Republican party to commercial honor and financial integrity has been its greatest achievement since it freed the slaves.

A vote for Bryan is a vote to haul down the gold standard and hoist the white flag; to sail out of the path of international prosperity into the dead waters of isolation; to call down the noblest aspirations of patriotism and to proclaim our country a coward and a shirk in the family of nations!

So much for our obligations to mankind in general. As to our duty to ourselves—our obligations to be honest in our own financial and industrial affairs; to provide for our own people; to continue in our own land the conditions which have enabled us to provide remunerative employment for labor, active and increasing operations for capital, and a general support of and respect for the tribunals of justice—that duty needs only to be stated to stand out to the eyes of all men. The elections in Vermont and Maine show that the citizens of New England abide by their convictions, and favor, as they did four years ago, the unflinching discharge of duties as well as debts. They refused to be frightened by the bogie of Imperialism. They set an example to their fellow-citizens, North, South, East and West. They have heartened the strong and strengthened the weak. I have every confidence that the voters of the United States, now fifteen millions strong, will re-elect President McKinley. And not the least interesting element in this deliberate exercise of the highest

duty and obligation of citizenship will be a disregard of party lines. The best men in the Democratic party realize that the interests of our common country would be seriously imperilled by the election of Bryan.

The cost of a national blunder this fall would be inconceivable. The paralysis of capital, the destruction of wages, the suspension of payments, the cessation of business operations, would, after all, be of minor moment, as compared with the profound discouragement of our national aspirations and the world-wide disgrace of our commercial name.

T. C. PLATT.

---

## IX.

### THE PARAMOUNT ISSUE.

THE welfare of the country is paramount in every political contest. No political party can always be right; but one party or the other must be trusted with the reins of government. It is sometimes difficult to determine which party would be likely to govern the country best. In the present contest the Republican party stands for law order, honor, progress, and good government, while the Democratic party makes loyalty to rebels in arms against the United States the paramount issue. Under these circumstances, it is plain to every patriotic man that duty to our country demands that the Republican party should be continued in power.

Four years ago the silver question was the paramount issue. I believed then, and I believe now, that the demonetization of silver, whether ignorantly or corruptly accomplished, was the greatest calamity of the nineteenth century. It reduced the supply of money and enhanced its value fully one hundred per cent., and the general range of prices fell in twenty years more than fifty per cent. Property invested in bonds and other money futures was doubled, while all other property lost one-half of its exchangeable value. I believed that Mr. Bryan was earnestly in favor of silver, and that he was an honest and sincere man, and I believed that if the Democratic party could gain power on that issue, it would do everything possible to restore the coinage of silver. So strong was my conviction that the good of the country

required the mintage of silver equally with gold, that I left the Republican party and labored zealously to elect Mr. Bryan.

But times have changed, and Mr. Bryan has changed. At all events, he has developed characteristics incompatible with patriotism or honor. The contention of the silver men that more money would restore prosperity has been verified. A thousand million dollars of new gold from the mines since 1896, a hundred million dollars added to the bank currency, and the war expenditures have raised prices, furnished employment for all, and created the good times which the remonetization of silver would have produced. The money question will not be considered by the people when money is plentiful, and the advocates of silver must wait until the bounteous flow of gold from the mines is diminished and falling prices come again. The financial issue will then be paramount. Any attempt to make the silver question an issue when money is abundant will not advance the cause, but, on the contrary, will create a prejudice in the minds of the people against the white metal.

Under these circumstances, it was natural for Mr. Bryan to seek some other issue. His success in creating what he terms the "paramount" issue, and forcing the Democratic party to adopt it, is an exhibition of genius and leadership without a parallel in American politics. "Imperialism" is a myth. It does not exist, and it can not exist in this country. Everybody in all parties is opposed to it. No President has ever attempted to maintain a larger army than was necessary to defend the honor of the country and maintain law and order.

No one knows better than Mr. Bryan that there is no real issue of imperialism, because he virtually admits that there would have been no imperialism to fight if he had not secured the ratification of the treaty with Spain, by which we acquired the Philippines. Nearly all of his two hours' speech of acceptance at Indianapolis was devoted to imperialism as growing out of the acquisition of these islands. He even congratulates himself on having secured the ratification of the treaty, and points to the result as justifying the means. He says:

"I believe that we are now in a better position to wage a successful contest against imperialism than we would have been had the treaty been rejected."

Very true. If the treaty had been rejected, Mr. Bryan's two

hours' speech against the acquisition of the islands would have been inapplicable, and he might have been unable to discover any other mirage with which to deceive the Democratic convention. The conduct of Mr. Bryan in securing the ratification of the treaty to create the issue of imperialism is crafty, and would be harmless in a person not the candidate of a great party for President of the United States.

The most remarkable part of Mr. Bryan's scheme is his assumption that expansion and imperialism are one and the same thing. The Democratic party is responsible for every foot of expansion previous to the purchase of Alaska by Johnson's administration, and every acre of territory acquired since the adoption of the Constitution has been acquired against the protest and generally against the sanguinary opposition of the inhabitants. The consent of the people has never in any case been given or asked. The few inhabitants of the land embraced in the Louisiana purchase, who knew what was taking place, protested, but the great mass of the people in that territory have continued their opposition in bloody wars for nearly a century, and still regard themselves as independent tribes or nations. The Florida purchase brought on the Seminole war, which lasted seven years. Both Mexicans and Indians occupying Texas, New Mexico, California, and Arizona were bitterly hostile to the change of sovereignty. The language of all cessions to the United States is precisely the same. The Philippines were acquired, so far as manner, form and substance are concerned, just as all other territory has been acquired by the United States.

Mr. Bryan's contention that the acquisition of the Philippines is imperialism stamps Presidents Jefferson, Monroe, Jackson, Polk, and Pierce as imperialists, and makes the establishment of free institutions and the erection of great states in newly acquired territory the very essence of imperial dominion.

Every act of Mr. McKinley's administration in dealing with the Filipinos has been based upon and modelled after the precedents of the great Democratic Presidents, whom the American people love to honor. The audacity of Mr. Bryan's charge of imperialism against President McKinley for following in the footsteps of Democratic Presidents in the acquisition and government of territories has taken the country by surprise.

If the contention of Mr. Bryan be right, then President Cleve-



land was the only occupant of the White House who was a real anti-imperialist. His refusal to accept Hawaii makes him the only Democratic model worthy of imitation, and distinguishes him as the only true patriot whose administration conformed to the Declaration of Independence. It is unfortunate that the greatest Jeffersonian Democrat who ever occupied the Executive chair should be unable to endorse Mr. Bryan's candidacy for President, with anti-imperialism as the foundation of mutual admiration.

The motives of Mr. Bryan in taking sides with Aguinaldo and his rebellious followers are not as well understood by the Filipinos as they are by our own people. The inhabitants of Luzon do not know that Mr. Bryan invented "imperialism," or that he has taken sides with them against his own Government, solely for the purpose of gaining votes. They do not know that an honest, successful administration and great prosperity are persuasive arguments in favor of the re-election of Mr. McKinley, and that the encouragement which the rebels in the archipelago are receiving from Mr. Bryan is a part of the great drama of legerdemain by which he hopes to hypnotize the American people, and induce them to jump out of the frying pan into the fire.

Mr. Bryan seems utterly heedless of the consequences of the aid and comfort he is extending to rebels in arms. He pays no attention to the accumulation of evidence that the guerilla warfare in Luzon is prolonged in anticipation of immediate independence in case of his election. The shooting of American soldiers and the murder and robbery of natives friendly to the United States, in order to keep up a show of resistance until the Democratic candidate becomes President, count for nothing when weighed in the balance against Mr. Bryan's ambition. I call upon all fair-minded citizens to read Mr. Bryan's speech of acceptance, delivered at Indianapolis on the 8th of August, 1900, and compare his utterances with the statutes of the United States against aiding and encouraging rebellion. It seems to me that section 5,334 of the Revised Statutes is applicable to his case. It is as follows:

"Sec. 5334. Every person who incites, sets on foot, assists, or engages in any rebellion or insurrection against the authority of the United States, or the laws thereof, or gives aid and comfort thereto, shall be punished by imprisonment not more than ten years, or by a fine of not more than ten thousand dollars; or by both of such pun-

ishments, and shall, moreover, be incapable of holding any office under the United States."

Mr. Bryan evidently fears that the paramount issue of imperialism which he has created will fade if kept too constantly in the focus of public opinion. His acrobatic qualities are brought into service nearly every day in mounting a new stalking-horse. His recent rough-riding of Trusts puts to shame the cowboys on a thousand hills. He proposes to destroy Trusts by creating a federal trust to control all other trusts. He says:

"Let Congress provide that, whenever any corporation organized in any State wants to do business outside of the State, it must go to the federal government and obtain a license which will enable it to do such outside business."

He does not say to which department of the Government he would assign this duty, but the presumption is that he would organize a Department of Trusts, in which only trusted favorites would be appointed. He says in his letter of acceptance:

"I shall select an attorney general who will without fear or favor enforce existing laws."

He does not say which party passed those laws. The only effective law against Trusts was recommended by President Harrison and passed by a Republican Congress in 1890. This law has been upheld and enforced by the Supreme Court of the United States. Under it, the Supreme Court of the United States held that a traffic agreement between thirty-one different railroad companies was illegal, and the court enjoined its further execution. Judge Taft, in the Circuit Court of Appeals, held, in the case of the Addystone Pipe and Steel Company *vs.* the United States, that a combination between six corporations not to compete with each other was illegal.

What law against Trusts was passed during either the first or the second term of Mr. Cleveland's administration? What efforts were made by Cleveland's Attorneys-General, Garland, Olney or Harmon, to prosecute trusts?

Mr. Bryan, in his Wheeling speech, says:

"I want to destroy every private monopoly in the United States."

Mr. Bryan's election would, therefore, sweep out of existence all patent rights, close the Patent Office, and destroy many other private rights which are of necessity exclusive and, consequently,

monopolies. It would put an end to the marvellous development of the mechanical skill of the American people, which has made the United States conspicuous throughout the world. It would deprive genius of both the incentive to exertion and the means of subsistence, and turn back indefinitely the tide of progress. Mr. Bryan's undigested views, wild assertions, and disastrous remedies for Trusts are undoubtedly the result of want of time to consider thoroughly any one subject, on account of the multiplicity of issues he seeks to utilize in order to be elected President.

In view of the prosperity of the country and the general increase of wages since 1896, the coal miners will naturally inquire whether their grievances result from McKinley's administration or are the work of a New York syndicate of heartless speculators, who miss the bond deals and the plunder of wrecked fortunes which they enjoyed under the Cleveland administration. When they discover, as they must, that the policy of the Administration has created general prosperity, and that extortion and oppression are inspired by private greed, they will not gratify the malice or desire for plunder of their real oppressors; nor will they listen to the cry of "stop thief" from those who rob their dinner pails, although that cry is echoed by the melodious voice of the Democratic candidate for the Presidency.

Mr. Bryan is a great orator, but he can hardly maintain the charge that the Republican party is responsible for all the evils, real and imaginary, that flesh is heir to. The assumption that all monopolies are created by legislation of Congress, and that the President of the United States is responsible for all disagreements and conflicts between employers and employees will not commend itself to sensible men. Mr. Bryan will learn that the American people do not live on hate alone, and that his efforts to array neighbor against neighbor, class against class, and to embitter the masses against the owners of accumulated wealth will not increase, but will diminish, his following.

I believe that a great majority of the people of the United States are beginning to regard Mr. Bryan as an able, adroit, and plausible sophist, possessed of wonderful magnetism and will power, but an unsafe man to be trusted in the high office of President of the United States.

WILLIAM M. STEWART.

## X.

## THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION—OUR DUTY.

Government by party, which seems essential under present conditions, furnishes platforms which usually commend themselves unreservedly to supporters; being made not so much to "stand upon" as to "get in" upon, nothing is proclaimed in them which is likely to offend any section of the party. Points likely to meet with disfavor are either ignored or smothered in meaningless platitudes. But occasions arise when the supporter who regards parties only as means to ends, differs from the official rulers and makers of platforms upon a vital issue, and he is then called upon to consider seriously whether it be of such paramount importance as to make it his duty to refrain from voting, or even to vote against his party. The former course is adopted frequently, the latter rarely; nevertheless it sometimes becomes our duty to go to this extreme.

In the last Presidential campaign the Gold Democrats reached the first stage and refused to vote for the candidate of their party, but did not generally vote for the opposing candidate. A candidate of their own was nominated; but many felt the standard of value to be of such vital importance as to dwarf all other considerations, and, preferring Country to Party, left their party, to support the Republican candidate. Those who did so were certainly actuated by a compelling sense of duty, for the leaving of party by loyal members is equivalent to the breaking up of family relations hitherto harmonious and happy. It is the last resort, only justified when all else has failed. We should labor long and hard for reform within our party before attempting to enforce reform upon it from without, yet it is not among the unswerving supporters of party that a country in times of trial finds its saviours. "My party, right or wrong!" and "My country, right or wrong!" are the cries of those who can never be of the highest value as citizens, or safe guides in a national crisis. On the contrary, these are the most dangerous of all classes to their country's welfare; for parties and States are bound to regard what is right and must be opposed by those whose conscience is awakened to wrongdoing by either. The most precious citizen is the man who will go with his country or his party only if it be

right, but who upon occasion hesitates not to condemn either when in his opinion it champions the wrong. It is not those who support but those who rebuke the wrong, whether of country or party, who are the salt of a nation, and truly patriotic. History abounds in instances where the voice and action of the few have saved a country, or have so impressed it that it has been deterred from following in a wrong path into which it has strayed. This is particularly true in regard to questions involving Peace or War. Among the axioms of the demagogue, none is considered safer than this: "Show the people 'sport' and they will follow you," the "sport" being the killing of men by men in battle under the name of war. It is so easy to "wave the flag" and carry the excited masses into bloodshed, but how low has the statesman sunk who descends to this! Dr. Johnson said to Boswell that "patriotism is the last refuge of a scoundrel." It is also the sure resort of the demagogue. War is always a winning card for the scheming politician to play when differences arise between nations, because it appeals to the baser part of man, dethrones divine reason, exalts brutal passion, excites the traits man shares with the brute which degrade humanity.

Our own country is young and its record, until recently, has been free from the crime of aggressive warfare upon other civilized peoples. The War for Independence was righteous, being in defence of constitutional liberties, which we should ever stand ready to defend. Its triumph benefited both oppressor and oppressed. It is better for Britain and for America that the one should be independent of the other. The War of 1812 was in defence of rights assailed upon the sea, and what the Republic fought for is now established. The War for the Union was equally for the benefit of North and South, of slave and of master. It preserved for all a common country.

It is from Britain, the elder branch of our English-speaking race, that the most valuable lessons are to be derived as to the folly of aggressive wars. The war against the American Colonies is now admitted by all parties in Britain to have been a mistake. The whole campaign against Napoleon, which still loads Britain with her huge national debt, is now seen to have been a mistake also. Under similar conditions, it would not be entered upon to-day. As to the Crimean War against Russia, Lord Salisbury has recently stated that it was a great blunder. The men most highly

honored in British history, as having been the true guides who pointed out the path their country should follow and denounced its errors, are Burke and Chatham, who denounced the American War; Bright and Cobden, who denounced the Crimean War; not George the Third and Lord North, nor the Jingoës who howled for the Crimean War against Russia. These now stand in their proper places as false guides, and, if truth be spoken, in many cases as demagogues, who played the card of war simply because that was the issue upon which they could ride to or retain power. The same fate awaits those who have precipitated war against the South African Republics, upon the pretence that they were concerned to make it easier for Britons there to abandon citizenship and become Afrikanders. Not these men, but Campbell-Bannerman, Harcourt, Morley, Courtney, Sir Edward Clarke and their colleagues are soon to be held in esteem, and extolled as the true patriots who protested against the wrong. In due season, also, those of our Republican party who drove the President into war and the purchase of the Philippines, against his own wise desires, will occupy a position similar to that of the British Jingoës. If there be one duty which a man of influence has to perform to his country higher than another, it is to refrain from arousing the passions of the people against other nations and to keep them in the paths of peace. Humanity has travelled far and upward in the ages past, but there still remains in us a sub-stratum of the savage, far too readily moved to draw the sword and kill. He who appeals to this as a means of popularity must despise himself, and in the court of his own conscience stand ever condemned, the most torturing punishment that can fall upon man.

In the present Presidential campaign, many Republicans who, like the writer, voted for the first Republican ticket and never voted any other than a Republican ticket, are called upon to consider the departure of the official leaders of their party from the policy of the Republic, in the purchase and attempted conquest of the Filipinos, with the intention of holding their country as conquered territory and not as part of the Union, with its citizens equal under the flag. The Union is to be composed not of one homogeneous whole, the flag is to wave not over citizens possessed of equal rights, but we are to follow the example of the military nations of Europe and endeavor to govern far distant peoples as subjects not citizens, vassals not freemen. No more complete

reversal of doctrines hitherto held precious by Americans can be conceived. In this attempt, up to last returns, we have already sacrificed 5,467 men killed or wounded, and squandered 186 millions of dollars, no doubt over two hundred millions to date, and constantly increasing, all wrung from the people by additional taxation. We have sent 81,000 soldiers to one of the twelve hundred islands we forced Spain to sell us for twenty millions of dollars, contrary to the instructions first given to the Peace Commissioners. Sixty-three thousand soldiers still remain there, and this force, more than double the entire standing army of the United States until recently, is still required to keep down the people. Hence, sufficient force could not be spared from Manila to rescue our Ambassador at Peking. One writer states that four thousand of them are in hospital; thus wastes our army away! And we only hold the region around Manila; all else of the 115,000 square miles of the territory we claim to have bought and are vainly hoping to conquer remains, as before, unvisited by our force. This is a serious situation.

The question which the member of the Republican party has to decide at this juncture is, whether this mis-step be sufficient to cause him to refrain from voting for its nominee, or even to vote against him. Before this can be decided, we must consider the alternative and its consequences, for our acts are right or wrong in political life according to the results to be avoided or attained for our country through them. It is to-day a question of weighing differing results against each other and deciding upon which side the balance of good lies.

Let us therefore consider the platforms of the contending parties.

The Republican platform is vague upon the anti-American idea of permanent, conquered, foreign dependencies outside of the Union. It says:

"Our authority could not be less than our responsibility; and wherever sovereign rights are extended, it becomes the high duty of the government to maintain its authority, to put down armed insurrection, and to confer the blessings of liberty and civilization upon all the rescued peoples. The largest measure of self-government consistent with their welfare and our duties shall be secured to them by law. To Cuba independence and self-government were assured in the same voice by which war was declared, and to the letter this pledge shall be performed."

No serious objection need be urged to this, except that we do not believe that the payment of two dollars per head for ten millions of the Filipinos can give sovereign rights over men, nor that Spain could give clear title against our allies the Filipino patriots, who had risen against her in righteous rebellion for independence. But the important point is that our party here pledges itself anew in its platform to give Cuba independence and self-government, fit work for the party of Freedom. What we should continue to press upon the party is to consider whether it would not be best to promise the Filipinos what we have promised the Cubans. It does not seem good sense to pursue a different policy for them. Admiral Dewey is not the only one who assures us that they are better qualified to govern themselves than the Cubans. What was good and wise policy for the one seems so for the other. We have encouraged "the highest aspirations" of the latter for independence, as President McKinley so finely said. We see here that the true mission of our giant republic lies in the creation and protection of the new republic of Cuba. We should one day, and not long hence, make our country the mother of nations, and regard the Republic of Cuba and the first Republic of the Orient as our noblest work, in line with the emancipation of our slaves. There is nothing in our platform antagonistic to this policy. The Republican party is the only proper agency for this sublime task. The Democratic party has earned no right by virtue of its past record to rob our party of its heritage.

The apologetic note is heard more and more touching the Philippines, which are rapidly proving themselves in every respect undesirable, and few indeed fail to express the wish in private, though their tongues may be silent in public, that the President had adhered to his original instructions to the Peace Commissioners. We shall probably soon return to the true path, welcoming expansion of contiguous territory where we can grow our own race and enrol them as citizens, but refraining from forcing our rule upon others in far distant lands or from ever accepting the idea that the American flag can permanently float over any but citizens possessed of equal rights, members of the one glorious Union, "now and forever indivisible."

Along with the platform, we are bound to consider the Man who is to steer the Ship of State under its provisions. Much depends upon him. What, then, of President McKinley, if his



official career is to be extended over a second term? What manner of man is he? No one who knows Mr. McKinley and his life can fail to wish for him, as an individual, many long years of unclouded happiness, for every domestic virtue is his. His place as a man is securely fixed in all hearts; but his official place in history, as one who has filled the highest political office upon the earth, we trust is not to be determined by his past, but by his future conduct of affairs; for, were he to retire at the end of his first term, his position must rank low indeed, for he would leave his country still involved in one of the most complete failures of modern times, the attempt to bring forth from his Pandora box, the Philippines, any result other than deplorable—a Sisyphean labor in which success is impossible.

The writer believes that the President, freed from the many embarrassments which hamper all Presidents during their first term, will prove more of a master, and that more of the President and less of his party managers will prove most advantageous for the country. He has been much wiser than others in the party who have shouted loudest. Let it never be forgotten that he was sound upon the question of war, and that his hand was cruelly forced by men far his inferiors in statesmanship. Again, he was entirely right in regard to the Philippines, as his instructions to the Peace Commissioners prove. Here, again, the shouting crowds, backed by political managers, drove him into a reversal of his wise policy. He was right, also, in regard to Porto Rico, but compelled by his political managers to retract, and agree to the present discreditable legislation. The writer has no desire to imply that, in his opinion, the party managers were not right in their view that an extension of our laws to Porto Rico, with the dark shadow of the Philippines behind, would have disrupted our party. He believes that the masses of working-men, both in agriculture and manufacturing, upon whom our party rests, will never agree to the free introduction of the products of tropical possessions; hence the mistake, in his opinion, of our party persisting in the effort to attach the Philippines or merge them into our political system. But Porto Rico being now a part of the Union, merged as a strategic base never to be surrendered, the President was right in holding it to be our plain duty to give it all the rights of Union.

Thus, upon all these important issues, the President has shown true statesmanship, and gives foundation for the hope that, during

his second term, with the people at his back, he will show increased and justifiable confidence in his own conclusions. He would be his own wisest counsellor, if he had a proper estimate of his own remarkable insight and faculty for grasping at once the true bearing of public affairs.

The marked success, thus far, of his management of the dangerous Chinese question, when Congress and party leaders are fortunately scattered, is another case in point. Left to himself, he has succeeded in giving our country a position never before attained in international affairs, and kept our government right when all others were wrong, Russia perhaps excepted, whose views were withheld until recently from public expression. The United States have taken and held the leading position among the co-operating nations from the start, and seem now to be the natural mediator through whom peace is to be restored. A higher honor for the Republic could not be imagined than that she should be the blessed instrument to bring about peace among men.

There is thus abundant reason to hope that President McKinley may yet shape events in such a way as to be able to repeat to the Filipinos his few potent words to the Cubans, promising his aid and protection in establishing a free and independent government, "thus realizing their highest aspirations." These few words would change the entire situation and give him rank with the greatest; for the future would then remember him as the Father, not the Suppressor, of the first Republic of the Orient, which, like the Cuban Republic, would come slowly but steadily forth under his fostering care. Next to Lincoln's emancipation of our own oppressed, this act would rank in the history of his country. Here lies true glory for a patriot to win for the Republic. Some President will win it; but we shall not believe that the prize is not reserved for President McKinley, and for the Republican party, to which such work properly belongs. It was born to emancipate, not to enslave. If it ceases to create Citizens, and creates and rules over Vassals to whom it denies equality in the Union, it deserves to die.

When we study the Democratic platform we find that its Americanism, as opposed to Imperialism, rings true. It stands, as the writer feels, for the true policy, the only policy consistent with the fundamental ideas which gave birth to the Republic, and to which it must hold true or fall from its hitherto proud position

among the nations of the earth. It is also American in every syllable against militarism, and the huge standing army for which our party is responsible, but which, let us hope, the coming Congress is to reduce. It is right upon Porto Rico, where it occupies the President's first position, and tells the people our "plain duty." It is right in regard to Cuba; but here our party, the writer rejoices to say, is in full accord. It is right, also, in regard to expansion. It is right in condemning the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty as un-American. It is right in regard to the Boers. It is right in regard to the speedy repeal of war taxes, but here again our party is equally so. One of the first acts of the new Congress, both from a party and a national point of view, should be the repeal of many petty, irritating taxes which should never have been imposed.

This being said, all has been said that can be urged in favor of the Democratic ticket. The most serious objection to it is not the proposed lowering of the standard of value, serious though that be. It lies in the insidious attacks upon the Supreme Court, which strike at the foundations of human society. It saps the roots of peace and order, and, if successful, substitutes license for law, and throws us back to barbarism, even to savagery. Without courts of law and profound reverence for their final decisions, which should be considered as sacred, we have nothing, for it is upon these that civilization rests. President McKinley at present stands for war and violence abroad, but Mr. Bryan stands for these scourges at home. Whatever Democrats may urge in explanation, or as to the literal meaning of the words employed, the fact remains that an attack is made in the platform of a political party upon a decision of the Supreme Court, the highest and grandest of all human tribunals the world has ever seen, and which, being undermined, there remains only civil disorder. It is not possible to support a party whose platform contains such an attack; better, far better, continue for a time the wrongful effort to force our government upon the Filipinos, in total disregard of Republican ideas, than fail to repel this covert attack upon the reign of law at home.

The Silver Issue, as a question for discussion, is a "back number." The only argument against the highest standard of value which had plausibility was the quantitative theory, which would be right if gold and silver were used for exchanges. But it is

groundless from the simple fact that for only five per cent. of exchanges are the metals used; to the extent of ninety-five per cent. they are transacted upon credit, and it is this vast fabric of credit, upon which the business of the world rests, that the threatened change of the standard of value would throw into confusion. The trifling five per cent. for which the metals are used need scarcely be taken into account. Since the supply of gold has been and is being so surprisingly augmented at a ratio ever increasing, Mr. Bryan is too late, for the question is no longer the scarcity of gold, but rather its threatened superabundance, as far as the stability of the standard is concerned, according to the quantitative theory, upon which Mr. Bryan has hitherto stood. Not a voice is heard any longer in any other part of the world against the gold standard. When the Democratic platform talks of international bimetallism, it harks back to a bygone delusion which all other nations have discarded. Fiat money is now the only lure that can hereafter be tried with any hope of winning votes; the monetization of silver having been discussed, decided, and laughed out of court throughout the world. Nevertheless, we cannot disguise the fact that the election of Mr. Bryan would undoubtedly cause apprehension to the timid, and a few timid men suffice to make a panic; for there is no chord more sensitive than the credit upon which ninety-five per cent. of all business rests. Mr. Bryan as President, with a Secretary of the Treasury of like views, might resolve to pay in silver as being coin—a course which would bring financial panic in every channel of business in an hour. In saying this, we pay Mr. Bryan the deserved compliment of recognizing that he has convictions, and that the danger of panic and all the suffering it entails to the toiling masses, who are ever the worst sufferers, is in exact proportion to the faith his countrymen have in his honesty and fidelity to principle. We all fear, and have a right to fear, that with a reputation for devotion to principle akin to that earned by Lincoln, Mr. Bryan would support and try to enforce his convictions. This means a President, with all the influence a President has in Senate and House, which is generally potent, determined by every means in his power to throw the exchanges of the country into chaos. We cannot be a party to aid his elevation to power, strongly as we approve his true Americanism as far as Imperialism goes, or deeply as his character and ability have impressed us. An earnest, honest man in the wrong

is more to be dreaded than the average politician, who changes with the wind. Mr. Bryan is much too earnest, too sincere and true to be entrusted with power, filled as he is with ideas subversive of economic laws, and of the laws upon which our complex human society rests.

The Democratic platform favors an income tax, which Mr. Gladstone declared "tended to make a nation of liars." So deeply impressed was he with its injurious effects upon the national character that he resolved to repeal it. That a true American can favor the miserable espionage required to enforce it is surprising. Nothing would be more un-American than to subject every man's business and financial affairs to the scrutiny of government officials, who would be in many cases affiliated with rival concerns or possible competitors in the future. The tax was cheerfully borne for some years during the War for the Union, and would be again under similar circumstances, although it would be a grave mistake to resort to it. The tariff is a far better instrument for assessing the rich, more effective, and free from objectionable espionage. The writer believes in collecting the revenues, as far as possible, from the rich, and favors heavy death taxes upon estates in lieu of income tax. There is no reason why the necessary expenditures of the government should not come chiefly from this class through such taxes, and through the tariff. When we tire of our Philippine policy—as we shall ere long—and reduce our army to its normal number, sufficient revenue will be easily secured. Costly foreign wines, tobacco, laces, silks, linens, broadcloth, and the thousand and one luxuries we import, should be made to pay excessively high duties. Domestic products are used by the masses; and those Americans who indulge in foreign articles, which are really luxuries, should be made to pay for their fastidious tastes as a matter of revenue. To tax foreign luxuries heavily and to collect a high percentage of death duties upon estates should be the policy, instead of exposing every man's business affairs and giving the dishonest the advantage over the honest, as all experience shows an income tax does, and must do in the nature of things.

Besides this, an income tax involves the creation of an enormous staff of permanent officials, who have in their keeping a knowledge of the private affairs of their fellow-citizens, dangerous to all. Even if these officials were appointed, as in Britain, sub-

stantially for life, the tax would soon be found intolerable in a new land like ours, free from a distinct and permanent official class unconnected with business affairs and leading lives as members of a profession apart from the people in general. We have in Mr. Bryan an extraordinary man—a typical American, as President McKinley himself is, a product that only American soil can grow—a man of the people in every fibre, like McKinley and Lincoln; but his career shows that the theoretical and superficial views of affairs still captivate him. He seems not to have studied down to the root of things, and he has yet to learn how often the theoretical and practical effects of legislation differ. In theory there is no tax fairer than that upon income, in practice none so injurious to a nation.

Again, we must believe that had he duly considered the effect of dragging the judicial decisions of our final Court of Appeal into the arena of party politics, he could not have sanctioned so flagrant a violation of the theory upon which our Constitution rests, which is that, over and above the Legislative and Executive, which constitute the Political Department, there sits the final and supreme Arbiter, the Judicial, in the calm atmosphere of Law, removed from the passion and violence of party, unmoved by political change, settling all disputes finally, and thus decreeing and enforcing peace among all persons and all parties, and even among the States themselves. In this Tribunal rests our assurance of continued peaceful development. The party which drags its judgments into a political campaign should be defeated. We should reverence above all other institutions the Supreme Court; it is so distinctively American, and is perhaps the most precious, as it is the most original, of all the features of that perfect work, the American Constitution. The elevation of the Judicial above the Political is almost unknown, and is wholly so among English speaking people, save with us; with all others the Political Parliament is supreme. There is thus nothing more American than the Supreme Court. Mr. Bryan's Americanism is sound only so far as Imperialism goes. Upon the Income Tax, and—ininitely more serious—upon the Supreme Court, the ark of our national covenant, he is no more American than President McKinley is at present upon his own truly American doctrines of "Criminal Aggression" and "plain duty."

We find many dangers ahead in Mr. Bryan's success. First:

that of License instead of Law at home, in our very midst, through political denunciation of judicial decisions. Second: not Gold and Silver, but Silver alone, since an inferior drives out a superior currency. This means defrauding Labor to the extent of one-half of its earnings under the gold standard, and the loss to the people of one-half of their savings in Banks, since these savings, which are now repayable in gold, would then be repaid in silver. Third: a Tax upon the Incomes of citizens, inaugurating an un-American system of espionage demoralizing to the national character.

We find against President McKinley's success a threatened continuance of the costly and unsuccessful attempt to suppress the laudable aspirations of the Filipinos for the independence of their country, in accordance with the American idea of the rights of man, which he has promised the Cubans, and for which Franklin, Hamilton, Jefferson, Adams, and the fathers of our country rebelled and Washington drew the sword. Mr. Bryan would bring upon his countrymen all the evils of civil strife at home, by undermining our courts of law. President McKinley's policy only requires our soldiers to shoot down men abroad guilty of the crime of fighting and dying for their country's independence. Class once arrayed against class at home, all is lost; restoration of peace and order could only come in a far distant future; whereas the employment of our forces in suppressing Filipinos abroad must be a matter of to-day only, for it is incredible that the people will tolerate this waste of men and money much longer. The writer believes that the end of it is near; but, even if he were mistaken, and it were left for the Opposition at a subsequent election to drive his party from power in Congress and restore the true policy by refusing to maintain the present huge standing army necessary for the purpose, he sees clearly and beyond doubt that his duty as a citizen is to support the nominee of the Republican party in the present contest, as being that party which alone can preserve the country from threatened dangers at home, so serious as to overshadow all other issues, and also as the party which will, in the future as in the past, administer the government for the highest and best interests of the Republic.

The Party of Protection of American Industries, of Internal Improvements, the Party of the Union, of Emancipation, and of the Highest Standard of Value for the money of the people, the

Party of Cuba Free and Independent, is not to be deserted for its failure so far to perform this same sacred duty to the Philippines. On the contrary, the party which has been for a generation the guardian of our country, and whose wise legislation has secured its present commanding position, may wisely be trusted to find the lost path and return to it, thus retrieving its error.

This the writer believes is to be the certain and not remote result, and for that end he shall continue to exert whatever influence he may possess or acquire, within, not without, the party for which he cast his first vote and for which he hopes to cast his last, and in this he is proud to follow Ex-Speaker Reed, Senators Hoar, Hale, Mason, ex-Senator Edmunds and others, statesmen eminent alike for party and personal service and for personal character.

ANDREW CARNEGIE.

---

## XI.

### WHAT OUGHT A GOLD DEMOCRAT TO DO?

THE unenviable position in which the Democratic party was left, after the adoption of the platform and the nomination of Mr. Bryan as a Presidential candidate four years ago, made inevitable the withdrawal from affiliation with the organization as newly constituted, of a very large number of men who, until then, had been not only believers in the principles of the party, but staunch supporters of its candidates. They refused their support from neither political pique nor thwarted personal ambition, but wholly because they saw in the new order of things, proclaimed under the guise of Democracy, a perversion of all those teachings and practices for which the Democratic party had stood in the past. To them, the candidacy of Mr. Bryan for the executive office was not that of a Democrat, but of one who had nothing in common with the principles of the party. The movement to stand for something Democratic, which found its origin among a few men before the Chicago Convention adjourned, its development at Indianapolis, and its fruition in the defeat of Mr. Bryan at the polls, was a movement for conscience sake, and in the true order of things it ought not to end until Democracy and Bryanism are not thought of as synonymous terms, and the difference between them has become so clear that "he who runs may read."



The Democrats who stood sponsor for the protest against the Bryanized Democracy of 1896 did so both for the good of their country and the betterment of their party. They knew that in serving the best interests of the former they could best serve those of the latter. The great majority of them had been Democrats always, making up in a large measure the membership of the directing force of the organization, and contributing the means of carrying on its campaigns. In refusing to indorse the vagaries of the Chicago platform and the candidate standing upon it, they did not become Republicans, nor accept as political truth Republican doctrines, nor approve of Republican candidates. They had in mind always that the first essential necessity, in saving the Democratic party, was the complete rout of those who had made it not only a reproach and a by-word, but an agency for evil to the best interests of the country.

In accepting Republican candidates now, they assume no other attitude than that which they took in the first instance. They justify their course now as they did then, believing that their highest duty, as citizens as well as party men, makes any other action impossible. They have not gone into, nor do they intend to go into, the Republican party, because they cannot reconcile themselves to the tenets of that party, which stand in direct opposition to principles which they have long held to be essential to a true and safe system of governmental control. Many of them then supported and voted for President McKinley, in spite of an antagonism to a large number of things for which he had stood in the past, because they felt that there were elements of conservatism in the organization and following of his party which could minimize the harmful force of the things to which they objected, on the one hand, and maximize those of which they approved, on the other. Undoubtedly, some of the men who aided in the Gold-Democratic movement of the last Presidential campaign have been disappointed in the President and his party in both directions; but I believe an unbiased consideration of all that has been done by the Administration, taken by and large, will lead to the conclusion that their effort in that behalf was at least worth while, and that much has been accomplished of great benefit to the country in many of its varied and important interests. It has been successful at least in establishing the gold standard through enacted law, and in refunding much of the public debt.

It has maintained the public credit and accomplished something toward the improvement of the country's banking law. If it has not gone as far in this direction as the friends of better banking facilities wish, it at least gives promise of taking no backward step. If the country has not been fully satisfied with its administration of foreign affairs, that fact is not a new one in the history of administrations. The conduct of the State Department, acting in conjunction with that of the Executive, is always a subject of general criticism on the part of the political organization out of power. Things are never just right, so far as the public is concerned, for the reason that the very nature of the conduct of state affairs precludes the taking of the public into full confidence. And yet it can be truthfully said that the foreign affairs of each Administration have shown in their conduct much of wisdom and great patriotism. The Administration has been severely criticised more than once for many things growing out of the Spanish-American war, but the war was one for which all political parties in the country stand responsible, and for the consequences of which none is more to blame than the Democratic Presidential candidate himself. He urged his party into it, entered the ranks of the soldiery himself and when it was over made himself largely responsible for the ratifying of the Treaty of Peace which brought the Philippine Islands into our possession, with all the attendant troubles which have followed them.

The extravagances of which complaint is made in the matter of governmental expenditures have been the extravagances which too frequently accompany the carrying on of war. It is to be doubted, however, whether under the same circumstances Mr. Bryan and those who are associated with him would have made a record meriting greater approval. The spirit of militarism pointed to by the opponents of imperialism grew in large measure out of the war which the two great political parties vied with one another in bringing on, and to which Mr. Bryan went as a commissioned officer. There is nothing, in either past or present events, to create a fear that the people of this country, even though the standing army has been enlarged and new military undertakings have been entered upon, will ever either jeopardize its liberties or encroach upon them by such a departure. Militarism may bring extravagances and cause demoralization among those who become actively identified with army life in foreign

fields; but it is beyond the range of possibilities that such a thirst for military glory and power can be fostered among those intrusted with the control of the army as to cause them to make an assault upon the people's rights for personal aggrandizement.

Unfortunately for the country, and doubly unfortunately for the Democratic party, neither is rid of Mr. Bryan and his advocacy of the pernicious doctrine of which he is the leading champion. We are in the midst of another campaign, with a great number of Democrats again placed under the embarrassment of having to choose between an emasculated and tainted Democracy and a distasteful Republicanism. There is no middle ground, nor can any course be pursued by the independent Democrat or Republican other than to support Republican candidates, until the things which have made Mr. Bryan a possible factor in American public life are completely eradicated. It will not do simply to scotch his doctrines at each recurring election. They must be killed, and the country must be rid of teachings that are a disturbing element in its social and political life. The question which confronted Democrats after the action of the party's representatives at Chicago four years ago comes to them now only with greater emphasis, since the gathering at Kansas City. The ailment which then bade fair to be but a passing spasm now seems to have taken on the virulence and distressing evil of a deep-seated disease. If heroic measures seemed requisite then, they are more so now, if any vestige of Democratic principles worth the saving is to be preserved as an element of good to the people in the administration of the country's affairs. The answer to the question as to what a Democrat ought to do, in the light of the circumstances which surround his party, is not difficult to render. He ought to exert himself to defeat Mr. Bryan, and make impossible thereby a future Populistic Presidential candidate and Populistic platform, masquerading under a Democratic party name. The salvation of the Democratic party lies wholly in such a course. Any other course means a continuance in control of those who have wrought loss, dishonor and disorganization to it. The principles of the party, stricken nigh unto death by Altgeld, Tillman and Weaver in 1896, have not been restored to their former virtuous vigor by these same men in 1900, and they can never be. The thoughtful Democrat, who will have regard to an analysis of his party's condition as it is, under the manipula-

tion of Mr. Bryan and his friends, will see nothing either in it or the condition of the country which warrants him in now sanctioning the things which were repugnant to his sense of public good and party loyalty four years ago. I cannot conceive of any lapse of time sufficiently great to make either economically or morally sound the vicious heresies announced as the embodiment of Democratic principles at the time of Mr. Bryan's first nomination, and reaffirmed in subservience to his dictation when he is now again presented to the country's electorate. The possibility of such a thing ranks with that never accomplished effort of the alchemist to transmute the basest into the finest of metals. Such a change cannot be brought about until a point is reached in the world's history when disapproval of the enforcement of law, repudiation of the sacred right of public and private contract and the non-integrity of courts of justice are recognized as the cardinal principles in a properly adjusted system of governmental economy.

The actions of the Democratic party, without Mr. Bryan and his isms, despite its lapses at times, throughout a long number of years, made for the country's good. It had been a generous contributor to the list of great names which have added lustre to the nation's history. Since the advent of Mr. Bryan as a leader, however, all this has changed, and the Democratic party has become the open advocate of discontent, strife and class prejudice. Its leaders to-day are men ill-acquainted with political history, and strangers to a serious effort to ascertain the origin and basis of economic truth. They are mere declaimers, who, taking their cue from their accepted leader, have produced nothing from their superficial familiarity with the writers of political economy but rhetoric, none of which stands the test of analysis. It is due to the country that, once for all, it be rid of such leaders of political factions and proponents of unwholesome ideas. The hope which Democrats indulge that, somehow and in some way, the party can outgrow Mr. Bryan and still tolerate his leadership is wholly illusive. Mr. Bryan and his views and the Democratic organization and its platform are interchangeable terms, as long as there is not direct and unequivocal repudiation of both by Democrats who have a care for their party's future. The same treatment must be accorded to Mr. Bryan, in a political sense, as was applied in a physical way by one of the early rulers of Persia to an unjust judge. This ruler flayed the despoiler and placed his

skin over the chair of justice which he once occupied, so that every one who should sit therein in future might take warning from the fate of his iniquitous predecessor—a circumstance that led one of the great Bishops of England, centuries later, to declare in that country of certain leaders who wronged the people that “it will never be merry in England until we have the skins of such.” So, too, it will never be merry in the Democratic party until we have the political skins of such as Mr. Bryan, to place in the seats of Democratic leadership, as a warning to all who, to advance the ends of personal ambition, willingly despoil the history, principles, traditions and standing of a great political party.

As long as Mr. Bryan leads Democracy, it is hopelessly wedded to a money standard which means repudiation of the nation's obligations and the impairment of the nation's credit, if once it should be powerful enough to accomplish such a result. It will not do to lull ourselves into a supposed security from danger on this score because Mr. Bryan has seen fit to cease talking on the money question. The people must not flatter themselves that Mr. Bryan has changed his views on this subject. He has not, and he will not. His erroneous views are fixed. He has only found it politic for the present to conceal them, and Mr. Bryan is nothing, if not politic in his demagoguery. He was the strenuous advocate of silver until he had gotten through with the Populist and Silver Conventions; but, once they were over, the advocacy of something else being necessary to bring votes and support, silver is made to give way to the issues of anti-imperialism and so-called “anti-militarism.” When it is once realized that Mr. Bryan is not a statesman but a charlatan and demagogue, who loves public applause and servile flattery, he will stand stripped of many of his supposed Spartan virtues. His craving is always for notoriety, and there is no means that is at hand that he will not avail himself of. He has never read beyond the elementary in his study of political economy; and, as a result, the consistency of his statements, one with the other, does not concern him. He is equally indifferent to the contradiction, by the course of events, of assertions which he has made and predictions which he has put forth.

It is urged that he is intellectually honest. The acceptance of this statement as truth by one who follows Mr. Bryan from day to day, in all his thousands of words, requires unbounded

assurance as to either the simplicity of his nature or the density of his ignorance. Mr. Bryan has been regarded by many as belonging in sympathy to what is termed the common people. That is a false view. He has led too many of the common people into grievous error by the sophistry and eloquence of his speech, and that, too, for his own political advantage and not to their advancement as a class. The establishment of any close bond of union between the workmen of the country and their employers would mean the loss to Mr. Bryan of every vestige of the support of the workmen, and, therefore, we find him continually a sower of strife between capital and labor. Any considerable exhibition of fraternity of feeling between this and other nations, sanctioned by general consent, would deprive him of another means of appealing to prejudice, and always we find him scouting such relations with other peoples. He inveighs against everything that is, and applauds something which might be, always having in view the bringing to himself the benefit which might accrue in a political struggle from a situation based on discontent and a desire for change.

I do not believe such a man can make a safe Chief Executive of a nation whose population is as varied as is that of the United States. We have here elements which, under a careful, thoughtful and intelligent leadership, always can be depended upon to stand for conservatism, but which, once guided by a leader who depends for his following wholly upon the gifts of oratory and flattery, with whom political expediency is political duty, become elements of danger. The country may, at times, doubt the entire sincerity of a leader who is so frank as to confound frankness itself, and it may to-day well doubt Mr. Bryan. The friends of the Democratic Presidential candidate are wont to excuse him on the ground that, once intrusted with power, he would find the conserving influence of the great office to which he aspires sufficient to restrain him from undertaking to enforce the radical theory which he advocates. There is, undoubtedly, a conserving force in the responsibility of office, which would cause a man of ordinary thought and action to hesitate from pressing measures that might cause great disaster. But Mr. Bryan is not of this class. He is not a man who thinks deeply or who acts wisely. He is always radical, and a careful investigation of his utterances, both in public and private, would reveal that element as the

predominant characteristic of his nature. It is as noticeable in his most carefully prepared addresses as it is in his extemporaneous ones. He has no intimates but the radicals of his own party, and even they are not on such terms with him as are the leaders of the Populists and Silver Republicans. It would be impossible for him as President to construct a Cabinet made up of men of temperate views on any public question. Any Cabinet which he would form would be as much of a menace as Mr. Bryan himself, because the only difference in views between them would be in degree of radicalism and not in principle. Heretofore, Democracy has sometimes affiliated with other political organizations, but it has never before lost its identity. It has swallowed them, but Mr. Bryan, reversing this order of things, has aided and abetted the conspiracy which aims to have Democracy absorbed by the Populists and Socialists. Whatever isms have found lodgment in the party have been controlled in the past, but this is not now the case. They control the Democratic party entirely, with the full approval of its candidate. Many rallying cries are put forth to disguise their meaning and purpose; but, back of them all, when they stand revealed in their full nakedness, is a socialism which is at war with property interests, great and small.

It is because of this fact, shown in many ways, that all business elements, of every character, importance or location, are against Mr. Bryan and the party which he leads. They do not wish to evade any legal responsibility, to pay less than their just proportion of taxes, to treat unjustly their employees or to deal unfairly with the public. They want only stability in money, equity in law, and wisdom of word and action in the Executive. They distrust Mr. Bryan, because he has made it impossible for them to trust him through his advocacy of things which their business knowledge and experience have proven to them would be disastrous, if once they were enforced. They distrust him not because he is a Democrat, but because he is not one. They know that Democratic principles, rightly interpreted and enforced, are productive of good. So, too, they know equally well that Socialistic doctrines, presented and incorporated into governmental affairs by a demagogue intrusted with power, could not but work out widespread loss and ruin. If Mr. Bryan, then, is not a Democrat but a Populist, why should any Democrat aid in his election? That he was named by the machinery of the party, so

long as that machinery was used simply to ratify the action of another convention and the principles of another party, means nothing. What possible good can come to the country by having Democracy, as now constituted and controlled, intrusted with power? What reform could it inaugurate and carry to a successful issue? It is impossible, in the very nature of its present organization, that Democracy could accomplish any remedial legislation that would benefit the people. On the other hand, it would, by its attempt to give the force of enacted law to the isms to which it is pledged, breed constant uncertainty and distrust. By the pronouncement of its own platform, it is against the gold standard and in favor of the silver one. It would, if given the power, abrogate the right of private contract, and thereby put a premium on dishonesty and evasion of just obligations. It does not believe in the enforcement of order by the lawfully constituted authorities, as against the will of mob law, if it speaks its true beliefs in its party preachment. It is against the country's courts of justice and the majesty of law, as that majesty finds expression in the Supreme Court, according to a platform once announced and many times reaffirmed. It has no use for a civil service which takes from the party worker the spoils of office, despite the fact that it gives to the tax-paying public a better return for the wage which the public provides. It means nothing on the question of a wisely adjusted tariff system, because it is swallowed up in the heresy of protection through its free silver doctrine. It has no force and effect when it speaks on the subject of class legislation, for Populism and Silver have made it wholly a party of special interest, promising each, through the "be it enacted" of legislation, special relief and privileges. Its denunciation of Trusts is a sham, branded so by placing the Trust-supporting and Trust-supported leaders of Tammany high in Democratic councils. In short, Mr. Bryan has brought the Democratic party to that unhappy condition where it can work injury to all and good to none.

As against all this, it is urged that Gold Democrats ought to support Mr. Bryan, because he does not believe in what is known as imperialism and militarism. There is nothing relative to the conduct of our colonial possessions that Mr. Bryan can possibly do within reason, that President McKinley will not do. The statement that Mr. Bryan makes that he will at once, if elected



President, convene Congress to create a stable government for the Philippines and establish a Monroe doctrine protectorate over them, is wholly idle. He knows that it is impossible to do so, until conditions as to education, guarantee of property rights and as to safety of personal rights, warrant such action. However many the blunders made which wrought the condition that now presents itself, the country is not willing, off-hand and unpreparedly, to set adrift—though retaining a full protecting responsibility for their acts—any peoples who have come to us through the Spanish war. Mr. Bryan misjudges popular sentiment if he thinks that, upon such an issue, he can blind the electors to those things which, affecting our own country, are more paramount than any involved in the issue he is now attempting to create.

The Democrat who really wishes to serve his country best will serve it and his party by voting for President McKinley's reelection. He will not do so as a Republican advocate of Republican principles, but as a Democratic protestor against Bryanistic heresies. There is no half-way house, nor is any good to be accomplished by refraining from voting. It is a case where the surgeon must cut, and cut deeply. When Mr. Bryan is driven from power the patriotic Democrat can go back into a full fellowship with his party; for, when that time comes, the Democratic party will stand for something with the advocacy of which the patriotic Democrat will be glad to be associated. As long, however, as the present status is maintained, he can have neither part nor lot with those who map out the policies of the Democratic party and control its acts.

JAMES H. ECKELS.